PART CCXX. (VOL. XVIII.) APRIL, 1889.

THE INDIAN ANTIQUARY,

A JOURNAL OF ORIENTAL RESEARCH

IN

ARCHÆOLOGY, EPIGRAPHY, ETHNOLOGY, GEOGRAPHY, HISTORY, FOLKLORE, LANGUAGES, LITERATURE, NUMISMATICS, PHILOSOPHY, RELIGION, &c. &c.

Edited by

JOHN FAITHFULL FLEET, C.I.E.,
BOMBAY CIVIL SERVICE,

RICHARD CARNAC TEMPLE,
CAPTAIN, BENGAL STAFF CORPS,

AND

WILLIAM CROOKE,
BENGAL CIVIL SERVICE.

CONTENTS.

PAGE

1. EXTRACTS FROM KALHANA'S RAJATARAMGINI, No. 2, by E. HULTZSCH, PH.D. 97
2. THE INSCRIPTIONS OF PIYADASI, by E. SENART, translated by G. A. GRIERSON, B.C.S. 105
3. SANSKRIT and OLD-KANARESE INSCRIPTIONS, Nos. 175 and 176, by J. F. FLEET, BO.C.S., M.R.A.S., C.I.E. 108
4. SOMALI AS A WRITTEN LANGUAGE, No. IV., by Major J. S. KING, BO.S.C. 116
5. FOLKLORE IN SOUTHERN INDIA, No. 30, by PANDIT NATESA SASTRI, M.F.L.S. 120

PAGE

CORRESPONDENCE:—

6. THE DANISH ROYAL ACADEMY'S PRIZE REGARDING THE PHILOLOGICAL POSITION OF SANSKRIT IN INDIA, by G. A. GRIERSON 124

MISCELLANEA:—

7. PROGRESS OF EUROPEAN SCHOLARSHIP No. XV., by G. A. GRIERSON 125
8. CALCULATIONS OF HINDU DATES, Nos. 27 and 28, by J. F. FLEET 127
9. PROFESSOR KIELHORN'S EDITION OF THE MAHABHASHYA, by GOVINDA DASA 128

BOMBAY:

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED AT THE EDUCATION SOCIETY'S PRESS, BYCULLA.

LONDON: TRÜBNER & Co. PARIS: E. LEROUX. BERLIN: A. ASHER & Co. NEW YORK: WESTERMANN & Co.

BOMBAY: EDUCATION SOCIETY'S PRESS.

1889.

[*All Rights Reserved.*]

Annual Subscription in advance, Rs. 20, or, including Postage, 36s., via Brindisi.

351.1
In39

10596

EXTRACTS FROM KALHANA'S RAJATARAMGINI.

BY E. HULTZSCH, PH.D.; BANGALORE.

(*Continued from* p. 73.)

No. 2.—EXTRACTS FROM THE FIRST TARAMGA; CONCLUDED.

THE remainder of the first Taraṁga treats of **the dynasty of Gônanda III.**, and introduces us to what purports to be a much more definite history, inasmuch as from this point there is given the duration of the reign of each king, and we have also the assumed starting-point of the accession of Gônanda III. in Kaliyuga-Saṁvat 1919 (expired), or B. C. 1182. For the period commencing with this point, Kalhaṇa does not quote any particular previous writers as his authority; and probably we come now to the details which, as he tells us in verse 15, were put together from his examination of the charters (*śâsana*) of previous kings recording the consecration of temples and grants to them, the laudatory inscriptions (*praśasti-paṭṭa*), and manuscripts (*śâstra*).

I subjoin a list of **the twenty-one kings of this dynasty,** with the supposed duration of the reign of each of them, and,—without at present entering on the question of adjustment,—with the year of the accession of each of them as deduced from the starting-point of the commencement of the reign of Gônanda III.

CONTINUATION OF LIST OF THE KINGS OF KASMÎR.

	Length of reign. y.	m.	d.
V. The Dynasty of Gônanda III.			
1. **Gônanda III.**; B.C. 1182; verses 185 to 191	35	0	0
His connection with his predecessor, Abhimanyu, is not stated. He continued the worship of the Nâgas (185), and restored the rites proclaimed by Nîla, thereby breaking the power of the *Bhikshus* or Bauddhas (186). He is mentioned (190) as an ancestor of Pravarasêna I., who will be introduced in Taraṁga iii. verse 97.			
2. **Vibhîshaṇa I.**, son of the preceding; B.C. 1147; verse 192	53	6	0
3. **Indrajit**; B.C. 1094; verse 193	35	0	0
His connection with his predecessor is not explained.			
4. **Râvaṇa**, son of the preceding; B.C. 1059; verses 193 to 195	30	6	0
He set up the *liṅga* called Vaṭêśvara (194), and endowed it with the whole country of Kaśmîr (195).			
5. **Vibhîshaṇa II.**, son of the preceding; B.C. 1028; verse 196	35	6	0
6. **Nara I., also called Kiṁnara**, son of the preceding; B.C. 993; verses 197 to 274	40	9	0
He was a wicked king, and brought much misfortune on the country (198). In consequence of his mistress being carried away by a *Śramaṇa*, who dwelt at the village of Kiṁnaragrâma (199), he burnt thousands of *vihâras*, and gave to the Brâhmaṇs the villages that had belonged to them (200). He built a town, which was called after him Narapura (244) or Kiṁnarapura (274), on the bank of the Vitastâ (202 and 260). This town was situated near Chakradhara (261 and 270), a Vaishṇava temple, whose name survives in the mound of Châkhdhar near Bîjbihâra (K. R. 18). King Nara fell in love with Chandralêkhâ, the daughter of the Nâga Suśravas, and the wife of a Brâhmaṇ named Viśâkha, who dwelt at the town of Narapura (203 to 253). Failing in his attempts to seduce her, he tried to take her by force from her husband (254 to 256). The Brâhmaṇ and his wife escaped and fled for protection to Suśravas, who destroyed the king and his town by thunderbolts (257 to 259). After the destruction of the city, the Khaśas became powerful (317).			

		Length of reign. y.	m.	d.
7.	**Siddha**, son of the preceding; B.C. 952; verses 275 to 285	60	0	0
8.	**Utpalâksha**, son of the preceding; B.C. 892; verse 286	30	6	0
9.	**Hiraṇyâksha**, son of the preceding; B.C. 861; verse 287	37	7	0
	He built a town named after himself, *i.e.* Hiraṇyâkshapura (287).			
10.	**Hiraṇyakula**, son of the preceding; B.C. 824; verse 288	60	0	0
	He founded (the town of) Hiraṇyôtsa (288).			
11.	**Vasukula**, son of the preceding; B.C. 764; verse 288	60	0	0
12.	**Mihirakula**, son of the preceding; B.C. 704; verses 289 to 324	70	0	0
	[He was in reality the son of a king named Tôramâṇa, belonged to the Hûṇa tribe, and came to Kaśmîr and finally established himself there, about A.D. 530, after a career in India that was terminated by Bâlâditya of Magadha and by Yaśôdharman, see *ante*, Vol. XV., pp. 245 to 252]. He was a cruel and vindictive king. During his reign, the country was overrun by the Mlêchchhas (289). He invaded Siṁhala, *i.e.* Ceylon, and overthrew the king of that country (294 to 299). On the way back, he put to flight the Chôla, Karṇâṭa, Lâṭa, and other kings, and ruined their cities (300, 301). He installed the god Mihirêśvara at Śrînagarî; and in (the district of) Hôlâḍâ he built a great city named Mihirapura (306). He gave *agrahâras* to outcaste Brâhmaṇs from the Gândhâra country (307). He diverted the river Chandrakulyâ (318). So hateful was he, that it was only the power of the gods that prevented his subjects from rising and slaying him (324). And yet he was not altogether wicked; for, even when the country was overrun by the Dâradas and Bhauṭṭas, and the national religion was destroyed, he still insured the maintenance of pious observances (312); and at Vijayêśvara he granted a thousand *agrahâras* to the Gândhâra Brâhmaṇs (314). Finally, in his old age, he became much afflicted with disease (309); and eventually he atoned for all his sins and acts of cruelty, by immolating himself in the flames, on a plank studded with razors, swords, and knives (315).			
13.	**Baka**, son of the preceding; B.C. 634; verses 325 to 335	63	0	13
	He restored justice and security (328). He founded the temple of Bakêśa, diverted the river Bakavatî, and built the town of Lavaṇôtsa (329), where he reigned (330). His death was caused by the witch Bhaṭṭâ, who slew him, with a hundred sons and grandsons, as a human sacrifice to the Divine Mothers at Khêrî (331 to 335).			
14.	**Kshitinanda**, son of the preceding; B.C. 571; verse 336	30	0	0
15.	**Vasunanda**, son of the preceding; B.C. 541; verse 337	52	2	0
	He was the author of a *Kâmaśâstra* or work on the science of love (337).			
16.	**Nara II.**, son of the preceding; B.C. 489; verse 338	60	0	0
17.	**Aksha**, son of the preceding; B.C. 429; verse 338	60	0	0
	He established the village of Akshavâla (338).			
18.	**Gôpâditya**, son of the preceding; B.C. 369; verses 339 to 345	60	6	0
	He bestowed Sakhôla, Khâgi, Kâhâḍigrâma, Skandapura, Śamâṅgâsa, and other *agrahâras* (340). He consecrated the temple of Jyêshṭhêśvara on the Gôpâdri hill, and granted the Gôpa *agrahâras* (341). He banished neglectful Brâhmaṇs to Bhûkshîravâṭikâ and Khâsaṭâ (342); and induced others, of purer habits, to immigrate, and settled them in Vaśchika and other *agrahâras* (343).			
19.	**Gôkarṇa**, son of the preceding; B.C. 308; verse 346	57	11	0
	He founded the temple of Gôkarṇêśvara (346).			

	Length of reign. y.	m.	d.
20. Narêndrâditya I., also called Khiṅkhila, son of the preceding; B.C. 250; verses 347 to 349	36	3	10
He consecrated the temple of Bhûtêśvara, and diverted the river Akshayiṇî (347). His *Guru* Ugra built the temple of Ugrêśa and a circle of the Divine Mothers (348).			
21. Yudhishṭhira I., also called Andha-Yudhishṭhira, son of the preceding; B.C. 214; verses 350 to 373	(Not stated)		
He lost the throne and was exiled through a conspiracy of his ministers with some neighbouring kings (360 to 373).			
TOTAL.....	968y.	2m.	23d.

Thus, from the beginning of the reign of Gônanda III. to the end of that of Narêndrâditya I., the text purports to account for a period of 968 years, 2 months, 23 days. In the explanation of Taraṁga i. verses 48, 49, I venture to agree with M. Troyer against Dr. Bühler, and to translate :—"Misled by the tradition that the Bhârata (*war*) took place at the end of the Dvâpara (*yuga*), some have considered as wrong the sum of years (*contained in the statement that*) in the Kaliyuga the kings, beginning with Gônanda (I.), ruled over the Kaśmîras for 2268 years." Kalhaṇa does not really doubt the correctness of this number. What he seeks to do, is, to prove, with its help, that the great war took place in Kaliyuga-Saṁvat 653 (expired), or B. C. 2448. Taking this number, and deducting from it the 1266 years during which there reigned the fifty-two kings from Gônanda I. to Abhimanyu,[1] there remain 1002 years as the period of the dynasty of Gônanda III.; and further deducting the 968 years, 2 months, 23 days, made out above, there remain 33 years, 9 months, 7 days, as **the supposed length of the reign of Yudhishṭhira I. or Andha-Yudhishṭhira.**

These numbers admit of being controlled in the following manner :—According to Kalhaṇa's own statement (i. 53), a rough number of 2330 years had elapsed from the accession of Gônanda III. up to the time of the author himself. Deducting from these 2330 years the 1002 years from Gônanda III. to Yudhishṭhira I., there remain 1328 years to be accounted for. An addition of the figures, which are mentioned in the seven later Taraṁgas, gives a slightly different result :—

	y.	m.	d.
Total of the reigns of the second Taraṁga	192	0	0
" third " [2]	589	10	1
" fourth " from (1). Durlabhavardhana to (14). Bṛihaspati[3]	212	5	27
Add the period from the death of Bṛihaspati, Saptarshi-Saṁvat [38]89 (iv. 702), to the date of the *Râjataraṁgiṇî*, Saptarshi-Saṁvat [42]24 (i. 52)	335	0	0
Total	1329	3	28

In order to reconcile this total with the result of the first calculation, we have the choice between two ways of procedure. Firstly, the reign of Yudhishṭhira I., which was made out above as amounting to 33 years, 9 months, 7 days, might be shortened by 1 year, 3 months,

[1] See my previous paper.

[2] At the end of the third Taraṁga, P has the following verse :— सैकोननवतिश्चात्र वर्षाणां शतपञ्चकः । दशभिश्चाधिकाः सैकाहा गता दशसु राजसु ॥. In order to obtain this total, read चत्वारिंशतं in verse 379 and चतुर्भिर्मासैरूनां in verse 526 of the Paris edition.

[3] The length of these 14 reigns is correctly given in M. Troyer's table, Vol. II. p. 366, besides that of the 9th king, Saṁgrâmâpîḍa, who ruled only for 7 days (सप्त वासरान्), and not for 7 years.

28 days, the difference between both totals. This would, however, necessitate an identical deduction from the 2268 years of the first Taraṁga (verse 48), which seem to have been one of the bases of Kalhaṇa's chronology. Therefore, it will be necessary to assume the second alternative, that Kalhaṇa gained his 'rough' number of 2330 years by disregarding the odd months and days which are found in the totals of the reigns of the third and fourth Taraṁga. If the extra 10 months and 1 day of the third, and the extra 5 months and 27 days of the fourth Taraṁga, are left out of consideration, the result of the second series of items will be 1328 years, as it ought to be theoretically according to the first calculation. To sum up, it seems very probable that Kalhaṇa placed the end of the reign of **Yudhishṭhira I.** and the accession of **Pratâpâditya I.** in Kaliyuga-Saṁvat 2921 (expired), or B. C. 180.

TRANSLATION.

(185) King **Gônanda III.**, who obtained the kingdom at this juncture, caused the processions, sacrifices, &c., to **the Nâgas** to take place just as before. — (186) After this king had restored the rites proclaimed by Nîla, the *Bhikshus* and the detrimental effects of the snow passed altogether away. — (187) Whenever there is a time of need, the good deeds of subjects produce kings who re-organize the far-decayed country. — (188) Those who strive to oppress the people, perish together with their lineage; but prosperity attends the race of those who will repair the loss. — (189) Having observed this (*foreboding*) sign at every event (*which has happened*) in this country, the wise are able to foresee the good or bad luck of future kings. — (190) **Pravarasêna (I.) and other virtuous and immortal descendants of this (king)** who renewed the country, enjoyed this earth for a long time. — (191) This prince **(Gônanda III.)**, who was **the first of the race of Gônanda,** just as Raghu was the first of the race of Raghu, ruled over the earth for **thirty-five years.**

(192) The son of Gônanda, called **Vibhîshaṇa (I.)**, protected the earth for **sixty years, diminished by six years and six months.**

(193) There ruled successively **Indrajit and Râvaṇa,** father and son, for **thirty-five** and for **thirty and a half years.** — (194) The *liṅga* (*called*) **Vaṭêśvara,** which **Râvaṇa** (*founded*) for the purposes of worship, is (*still*) resplendent; the colour of its line of dots has been observed to foretell coming events. — (195) That prince gave the whole country of **Kaśmîra** to Vaṭêśvara, whom he had placed in a *maṭha* with four halls.

(196) The long-armed **Vibhîshaṇa II.,** the son of king **Râvaṇa,** enjoyed the earth for **thirty-five and a half years.**

(197) Then **Vibhîshaṇa's son,** called **Nara,** whose other name was **Kiṁnara,** and whose prowess was praised in song by the Kiṁnaras, became king. — (198) Though (*at first*) of good conduct, this prince produced a series of great misfortunes, through the bad luck of his subjects, and through the vice of sensuality. — (199) An ascetic (*śramaṇa*), who dwelt alone in a *vihâra*, which was situated at **Kiṁnaragrâma,** carried off his (*the king's*) mistress by the power of magic. — (200) Angry on account of this (*act*), he (*the king*) burnt thousands of *vihâras*, and bestowed their villages on Brâhmaṇs, who resided in the *maṭhas* (*which were situated in their*) midst. — (201, 202) On the bank of the **Vitastâ,** he built, with the riches which he had acquired by conquering the world, a town, which appeared to be a synonym of "Heaven" and surpassed the town of Kuvêra. Its market was full of roads; its river resplendent with navigation; and its gardens teeming with flowers and fruits. —

---

185 Here, and in 191, 192, P reads गोनन्द, as opposed to the गोनर्द of C and T. This mistake of the Calcutta Paṇḍits was first rectified by Dr. Bühler, K. R. p. 54.

186 हिमदोषाश्च P T. 189 देशे P T.

190 वंश्यैरियं T. Pravarasêna was the name of two kings of Kaśmîr; it is here mentioned as a representative of the restored line of Gônanda III., *viz.*, of the kings from Mêghavâhana to Bâlâditya (see Taraṁga iii.).

193 °त्सहार्धाश्च P. 195 कश्मीर° P. 196 °क्षोणि° P. सार्धामन्यो P T. 199 °श्रेक: P.

203 °ञ्चितम् P; °ञ्चित: C T; read चितम्. Instead of नाघो, which is also the reading of P, read नाघा.

(203) In a garden at that (*town*) there was a lake filled with clear and sweet water, the dwelling-place of a **Nâga, Susravas** by name. — [(204 to 253) The Brâhmaṇ Viśâkha marries **Chandralêkhâ**, the younger daughter of **the Nâga Susravas**, and lives with her at **Narapura. King Nara** falls in love with **Chandralêkhâ**]. — (254) Having cast off the fetter of shame, he frightened that woman by trying to seduce her through messengers, who pleaded (*his*) desire. — (255) When (*he found that*) she was not to be persuaded by any means, the libidinous (*king*) asked even her husband, the Brâhmaṇ, for her. Of what are those ashamed, who are blinded by passion? — (256) After the king had been repeatedly rebuked also by that (*Brâhmaṇ*), he despatched soldiers, to carry her away by force. — (257) Attacked by these from the front of the house, the Brâhmaṇ escaped with his wife by another way, and fled to the palace of **the Nâga** for protection. — (258) When the two had arrived and reported that event, the lord of snakes, who was blind with rage, rose from the lake. — (259) Having produced dense darkness by roaring and lowering clouds, he burnt the king with his town by a shower of terrible thunder-bolts. — (260) Carrying away the oily fat and blood, which dropped from the burnt human bodies, **the Vitastâ** became, as it were, marked with the eyes of a peacock's tail. — (261) Thousands of frightened people, who entered for refuge the presence of (*the god*) **Chakradhara** (Vishṇu), were burnt in an instant. — (262) Just as formerly the fat of the thighs of (*the demons*) Madhu and Kaitabha, thus many bodies of burnt people then covered Chakrin (Vishṇu). — (263) At that time the sister of **Susravas, a Nâgî called Ramaṇî**, came from a cave in the hills, to help (*her brother*), carrying heaps of rocks.— (264) When more than a *yôjana* of the way remained, and she perceived from afar that her brother had been successful, she pelted a shower of rocks on the villages. — (265) Then the ground of the villages became stony for five *yôjanas*. This (*ground*), called "**the forest of Ramaṇî**," is even now covered with huge rocks. — (266) Having produced a terrible destruction of people, the snake (Suśravas), filled with remorse and depressed by the censure of the world, left that place next morning and went away. — (267) A lake, white as the milk-ocean, which he created on a distant mountain, is even now seen by the people at the procession to **Amarêśvara**. — (268) At the same place, another lake, (*viz.* that) of the Brâhmaṇ, who had become a Nâga by the favour of his father-in-law, is known by the name of "the lake of the son-in-law." — (269) Fiendish (*kings*), who fearlessly produce destruction under the pretext of protecting their subjects, suddenly fare thus. — (270) Even now people remember this story, when they behold, near **Chakradhara** that town which was burnt and that lake which became a (*dry*) hole. — (271) How great a vice must passion be considered in short-sighted kings! Through it there happened to him that which has never happened to another. — (272) We hear that even the three worlds were lost in every case through the anger of even a single virtuous wife, deity, or Brâhmaṇ. — (273) Having enjoyed the earth for **forty-one years less by three months**, that king perished through his bad conduct. — (274) That **town of Kiṁnara**, the circle of whose walls and watch-towers had been visible (*only*) for a very short time, became similar to the town of the Gandharvas (*i.e.* it faded away like a mirage).

---

[257] सजानिः P C.

[261] Chakradhara was the name of a temple of Vishṇu near Bijbihâra (Vijayêśvara). Its site has been identified with the mound of Châkhdhar by Dr. Bühler, K. R. p. 18. See also *Journal of the German Oriental Society*, Vol. XL. p. 7.

[262] °मेदः P T. Madhu and Kaitabha are the names of two demons, who were killed by Vishṇu.

[264] सा P T.

[270] भस्मीभूतं P. The town referred to is Narapura (244) or Kiṁnarapura (274), which king Nara or Kiṁnara had built on the bank of the Vitastâ (202) and which was burnt by the Nâga Suśravas (259). The dried-up lake is that, in which the latter was originally living (203). The present verse shows, that Narapura was situated near the temple of Chakradhara (see note on verse 261). It appears to have been destroyed by one of the earthquakes which are frequent in Kaśmîr.

[271] मतः P. °भूत्कापि P T. [273] मासैश्चोनां, भुक्त्वा and दुर्नयेन P. [274] अन्यल्व° P.

(275) Through the wonderful diversity of the course of fate, his only son, who had been brought to **Vijayakshêtra** by his nurse, did not lose his life. — (276) This king, called **Siddha**, refreshed the exhausted people, just as the cloud a mountain, which is parched by a forest-fire. — (277) Thus the strange fate of his father became to this magnanimous one a beneficial instruction in the knowledge of the vanity of the world. — (278) Though in the midst of enjoyment, he could not be led into sin by it, just as the spotless image of the moon remains undefiled, though it is reflected in a quagmire. — (279) In the midst of princes, who were hot with the fever of pride, he alone recovered (*from it*) by meditating incessantly on Śiva. — (280) Abandoning gems like trifles, this virtuous one found (*the only*) perfect ornament in the worship of Śiva. — (281) The royal splendour of this king followed him to another world, because he cunningly combined it with unfailing virtue. — (282) Having ruled over the earth for **sixty years**, he, accompanied by his near attendants, ascended with his body to the worlds of Śiva. — (283) Having sought refuge with (*the preceding king*) **Nara**, the servants had got into a deplorable state; but, depending on his son **(Siddha)** as their lord, they became worthy of praise in the world. — (284) A dependant shares the fate of his lord, be it blamed in the world or praised by all men. A rope of straw descends, if it is attached to the bucket of a well; if it is tied to flowers, it ascends on the head of a god. — (285) "Here is **Siddha**, (*who has become*) a demi-god (*Siddha*) with his body;" this announcement was proclaimed by the gods in heaven, with beating of the drum, for seven days.

(286) His son, who received the name **Utpalâksha** (*i.e.* the lotus-eyed) on account of his lovely eyes, ruled over the earth for **thirty and a half years.**

(287) His son **Hiraṇyâksha**, who enjoyed the earth for **thirty-seven years and seven months**, built a town, which was designated by his name.

(288) His son **Hiraṇyakula**, who founded **Hiraṇyôtsa**, was (*king*) for **sixty**, (*and*) his son **Vasukula** (*likewise*) for **sixty years.**

(289) Then, when the country was (*again*) overrun by a **Mlêchchha tribe**, his son **Mihirakula**, who was of cruel deeds and resembled Kâla (or Death) (*in destructiveness*), became king. — (290) In him the northern region possessed another Antaka (or Death), thus rivalling the southern region, the regent of which is (*the god*) Antaka. — (291) His approach was always heralded by the flights of vultures, crows, &c., that flew before him, eager to devour those who were being slain among his troops. — (292) He was a very ghoul of a king, surrounded day and night by thousands of slaughtered beings even in his pleasure-houses. — (293) This cruel murderer had no pity or respect for children or women or aged men. — (294 to 299) One day he noticed that the breasts of his queen, who wore a muslin bodice from **Siṁhala** (or Ceylon), were marked with golden foot-prints. Burning with wrath, he questioned the chamberlain, and was told that, in **the Siṁhala country**, it was customary to impress the material with the stamp of the king's foot. This explanation failed to appease him; and he set out on a campaign as far as **the southern ocean**, and ousted **the king of Siṁhala.** Instead of him, he set up another king; and he brought away a woven cloth called *yamushadêva*, stamped with an image of the sun. — (300, 301) On his way back, he put to flight the **Chôla, Karṇâṭa, Lâṭa and other kings**, whose ruined cities announced their

---

275 वैचित्र्या° and स्वधात्र्या P. 277 पित्र्यं P T. °ताज्ञाने P.

279 °ज्वरोष्ण° and °तोषयौ P. 291 °द्धूर्तो P. 295 प्राघोषयंस्ताडयन्तः P.

296 साधौ P. 298 हिरण्योत्सकृदात्मजः and वसुकुल° P.

289 to 324. I use here Mr. Fleet's abridged translation, from the Calcutta edition, published *ante*, Vol. XV. p. 247ff.; altering some details and the numbering of the verses according to the Śârada MS.

295 °मदाज्ञतः P.

299 °शक्तिरपा° T; °शतिरुपा° P; °शक्तिमपा° C. As the first part of the king's name, Mihira, is doubtlessly of Irânian origin. The term *yamusha* might be derived from the same source; perhaps it is a corruption of *amesha*, 'immortal,' which occurs in the Avesta as an attribute of the sun.

300 °लाटादींश्च P. गन्धेभो PT. व्यधारयत् PC.

capture to their rulers when these returned into them on his departure. — (302, 303) As he came to the "Gate" of **Kaśmira (Kâśmira-Dvâra)**, he heard the terrified cries of an elephant that had fallen into a chasm; and the sounds gave him such exquisite pleasure, that he caused a hundred other elephants to be wantonly destroyed in the same way. — (304) As the touch of the sinful defiles the body, so does a description of them defile the speech; accordingly, all his other cruel deeds are not detailed, (*lest they should pollute the narrator*). — (305) But who can fully comprehend the behaviour of men whose minds are uncultivated, and who do evil deeds? for even he made an assumption of religion, for the sake of acquiring merit. — (306) Thus, evil-minded as he was, he installed (the god) **Mihirêśvara at Śrînagarî**, and in **Hôlâdâ** he built **a great city named Mihirapura.** — (307) And he gave *agrahâras* to **Brâhmaṇs of the Gândhâra country,** the lowest of the twice-born, resembling himself in character. — (309, 310) At length when he, a very Bhairava incarnate, had reigned for **seventy years,** he became afflicted with much disease, and immolated himself in the flames; and a voice from the sky was heard to proclaim that, though he had slain three crores of people, yet he had attained final emancipation, in consequence of the disregard that he had shewn for his own sufferings also. — (311) Those, who report this, consider that he made amends for his cruelty, by his gifts of *agrahâras*, and similar deeds. — (312 to 316) For, even when the country was overrun by **the Dâradas** (and) **Bhauṭṭas,** (*who were*) **Mlêchchhas** of impure rites, and all (*the national*) religion was destroyed, yet he insured the maintenance of pious observances. And he firmly established the countries of **the Âryas**, and then performed a terrible penance, ordaining, as expiation for his sins, the burning of himself; in accordance with which he bestowed a thousand *agrahâras* at **Vijayêśvara** on Brâhmaṇs born in **the Gândhâra country,** and then gave his body to the flames, on a pyre which was a flat plank studded with razors, swords, and knives, and thus atoned for all his cruelty. — (317) Others excuse all his cruel acts by asserting that he performed them only in order to destroy **the Khaśas**, who had become powerful when the city was burned by the Nâga. — (318 to 324) As a final instance of his cruelty, one day, when he was diverting the river **Chandrakulyâ**, the work was hindered by a large rock that could not be uprooted and removed. Having performed austerities, he was told by the gods in a dream that a powerful Yaksha dwelt in the rock, observing the vow of chastity, and that the obstacle could be removed only by the touch of a chaste woman. Next day he had his dream put to the test; but no woman was found who could prevail against the rock, until a potter's wife, named Chandravati, touched it and displaced it. Whereupon, filled with anger, he caused three crores of virtuous women to be slain, with their husbands and brothers and sons. It was only the power of the gods, who caused him to do this act, that prevented his subjects from rising of one accord and slaying him.

(325) When at length he **(Mihirakula)** had perished through the good luck of his subjects, the citizens anointed his virtuous son **Baka.** — (326) Through the influence of (*their*) previous (*experiences*), which (I) have told, the people were afraid even of his rule, as of a pleasure-house built on a cemetery. — (327) Begotten by one who had caused excessive pain, he became a bestower of delight on men, just like a downpour of water, which follows on a cloudy day of the rainy season. — (328) Then people fancied that justice had arrived from another world, and that safety had returned from an inaccessible exile. — (329) Having founded (*the temple of*) **Bakêśa** and (*having conducted*) **the river Bakavatî** to a (*dry*) valley, the illustrious **Baka** built a town called **Lavaṇôtsa.** — (330) There the prince passed **sixty-three years and**

---

305 को वेत्त्युद्वृत्तचेष्टानां कृत्यां P. 306 होलाडायां P.

307 गान्धारा P. After this verse, C and T insert two spurious verses which are omitted in P.

312 दारदैर्भट्टै° P. The Dâradas are the inhabitants of Dârdistân, and the Bhauṭṭas are the Tibetans.

315 सुरखड्गासिधेन्वादि° P.

317 The reference is to the story of Nara I. and the Nâga Suśravas, verses 203 to 274 above.

319 यक्षः PT. 320 न स P. 325 बकस्त° P. 326 °रादुक्ताचासं दधे P. जनः PT.

327 °मात्तपात्यय° P. 329 बकेशं PC. 330 °वासरा

thirteen days, ruling the earth. — (331) Then, having assumed the appearance of a beautiful woman, a witch, called **Bhaṭṭâ**, approached the king at nightfall. — (332) Having weakened his memory by various pleasing words, she invited him, who was delighted, to witness the greatness of the festival of sacrifice. — (333) When the emperor, accompanied by his hundred sons and grandsons, went there next morning, she made him an offering to **the circle of the goddesses**. — (334) Even now there are visible on a rock the impressions of two knees, which mark the ascension to heaven of her, who became a demi-goddess in consequence of that action. — (335) Even now the god **Śatakapâlêśa**, the circle of the (*divine*) Mothers, that rock, and that story, are remembered in the *maṭhas* of **Khêrî**.

(336) Then his son **Kshitinanda**, who, (*like*) a bulb of the family-tree, had been spared by the goddess, ruled over the earth for **thirty years**.

(337) His son, called **Vasunanda, the author of a celebrated Kâmaśâstra**, ruled over the earth for **fifty-two years and two months**.

(338) His son **Nara (II.)** was king for **sixty (years)**; and his son **Aksha**, who caused the village of **Akshavâla** to be built, for **the same number of years**.

(339) Thereon his son **Gôpâditya**, who exhibited the return of the primitive age by his care for the castes and orders, ruled over the earth together with the islands. — (340) He gave away **Sakhôla, Khâgi, Kâhâḍigrâma, Skandapura, Samâṅgâsa**, and other *agrahâras*. — (341) Having consecrated (*the temple of*) **Jyêshṭhêśvara** on (*the hill called*) **Gôpâdri**, this virtuous (*king*) granted the **Gôpa** *agrahâras* to Brâhmaṇs born in **the countries of the Âryas**. — (342, 343) Having banished to **Bhûkshîravâṭikâ** those who ate garlic, he placed at **Khâsaṭâ** those Brâhmaṇs who neglected their rules of conduct; and, having imported other holy Brâhmaṇs from pure countries, he caused them to settle in **Vaschika** and other *agrahâras*. — (344) He, who obtained the title of "the uppermost guardian of the world" in panegyrical poems, did not permit the slaughter of animals except at a sacrifice. — (345) Having ruled over the earth for **sixty years and six months**, he went to the worlds of the virtuous, in order to enjoy the results of his good deeds.

(346) His son **Gôkarṇa**, who founded (*the temple of*) **Gôkarṇêśvara**, held the earth for **fifty-eight years diminished by thirty days**.

(347) His son was **Narêndrâditya (I.)**, whose other name was **Khiṅkhila**, and who caused the consecration of (*the temple of*) **Bhûtêśvara** and (*the conducting of*) the **Akshayinî**. — (348) His *Guru*, Ugra by name, who possessed the divine favour, and whose appearance was full of splendour, built (*the temple of*) **Ugrêśa and a circle of the (divine) Mothers**. — (349) Having been the lord of the earth for **thirty-six years and a hundred days**, the virtuous (*king*) obtained the sinless worlds in consequence of his prolonged good conduct.

(350) Then his son, **Yudhishṭhira (I.)**, whom people called **"the blind (Andha)-Yudhishṭhira"** on account of his small eyes, became king. — [(351-372) He loses the throne

---

332 °ग्लापित° P.

333 On *dêvîchakra* and *mâtṛichakra* (verse 335) see note on verse 122.

334 दृषद्यापि T.

335 खेरी° P. It appears from this verse that the Śaiva temple at Khêrî was called Śatakapâlêśa, "the lord of a hundred skulls," and that tradition explained that name by the sacrifice of king Baka and of his hundred sons and grandsons (verse 333).

338 भुर्मां P T.

340 °काहाडिग्राम° P T. शसाङ्गाम° P; शमाङ्गादि° C T; read शमाङ्गास°. On Khâgi (the modern Kâkapur) and Śamâṅgâsa, see K. R. verses 90 and 100.

341 On Jyêshṭhêśvara see note on verse 124, on Gôpâdri, K. R. p. 17.

342 व्यधान्वि° P; व्यथान्वि° C T; read व्यधादि°:

344 According to i 15, panegyrical poems (*praśasti*) were used by Kalhaṇa as correctives of his narrative. On *praśasti* see now Dr. Buhler's remarks in the *Vienna Oriental Journal*, Vol. II. p 86.

345 सषण्मासां P. °परीपाकं P C.

346 क्षीणां P. °हधे P T. °त्याङ्गां P.

347 °प्रतिष्ठायामक्ष° P; °प्रतिष्ठानामक्ष° C T; read °प्रतिष्ठाया अक्ष°. A temple of Bhûtêśvara or Bhûtêśa was already existing at the times of Aśôka and Jalauka I.; see i. 107, 148. In ii. 123 and v. 46, it is mentioned along with Vijayêśa. Akshayinî must have been the name of a river; compare note on verse 150, and Bakavatî in verse 329.

through a conspiracy of his ministers with neighbouring kings and has to leave the country with his wives.] — (373) Some benevolent kings, whose country the king visited, kindly alleviated his grief for the loss of his kingdom by various acts of courtesy, (*which appeared*) important (*as they were accompanied by*) strict obedience to his orders, (*and*) by hinting the cessation of his sorrow in words, which were pleasing through friendliness and earnestness.

Thus ends the first Taraṁga of the Râjataraṁgiṇî, the work of Kalhaṇa, the son of the lord Chaṇpaka who was the great minister of Kaśmîra.

REMARK.

In the Calcutta and Paris editions, the first Taraṁga contains 375 verses. Deducting the two spurious verses 308 and 309, which are omitted by P, there remain 373 verses. This actual number differs only by one from the colophon of P, according to which the first Taraṁga consists of 372 verses.

(To be continued.)

THE INSCRIPTIONS OF PIYADASI.

BY É. SENART, MEMBRE DE L'INSTITUT DE FRANCE.

Translated by G. A. Grierson, B.C.S., and revised by the Author.

(*Continued from p.* 80.)

SIXTH EDICT.

Prinsep, *l. c.* pp. 596 ff.; Kern, p. 92 ff.

TEXT.

1 Dêvânaṁpiyê piyadasi ' lâja hêvaṁ ahâ [.] duvâḍasa
2 vasa-abhisitêna mê dhaṁmalipi[1] likhâpitâ lôkasâ
3 hitasukhâyê [.] sê taṁ[2] apahaṭâ taṁtaṁ dhaṁmavaḍhi pâpôvâ
4 hêvaṁ lôkasâ hitasukhêti paṭivêkhâmi atha iyaṁ
5 nâtisu hêvaṁ patiyâsaṁnêsu hêvaṁ apakaṭhêsu
6 kimaṁ kâni[3] sukhaṁ avahâmîti tatha cha vidahâmi [.] hêmêvâ
7 savanikâyêsu[4] paṭivêkhâmi [.] savapâsaṁḍâ pi mê pûjitâ
8 vividhâya pûjâyâ [.] ê chu iyâṁ atanâ pachûpagamanê[5]
9 sê mê môkhyamatê [.] saḍvîsativasa abhisitêna mê
10 iyaṁ dhaṁmalipi likhâpitâ [.]

NOTES.

1. Misled by the following sentence, the meaning of which he completely failed to grasp, Prinsep interpreted the absence of the pronoun *iyaṁ* from beside *dhaṁmalipi*, as indicating that the edict of the thirteenth year must have been conceived in terms opposed to those of the present one, and inspired by doctrines which the king now repudiates. Lassen (II² 276 n. 2) adopts this strange idea with some reserve. The text in no way authorises such an explanation. Translated literally, the sentence gives this meaning and no other :—'It was in the thirteenth year after my coronation that I had an edict engraved for the welfare and happiness of the people,' that is to say, plainly, 'I had engraved *for the first time.*' Such an idea being aimed at, can alone explain the introduction of the sentence here. We shall see that this very simple observation has a conclusion at once extremely unexpected, and very important.

---

373 °स्थैर्यरुचित° P. °शान्त्या P T. इति काश्मीरिकमहामात्यचम्पकप्रभुसूनोः कल्हणस्य कृतौ राजतरंगिण्यां प्रथमस्तरंगः

P. The form Kâśmîrika occurs in all the colophons, while Kâśmîraka is used throughout the text. Kalhaṇa's father, Chaṇpaka, is erroneously called Champaka in the Calcutta and Paris editions. It is a curious coincidence that, in Tamil, the two forms *śaṇbaga* and *śeṇbaga* are used besides *śambaga*, the equivalent of the Sanskrit *champaka* (Michelia Champaca, L.).

It will be remembered that the concluding words of the 12th (Rock) edict are immediately followed at Khâlsi by characters which I have been able to correct with certainty into *aṭhavâsâbhisitasa*, the certain equivalent of which, though greatly altered, reappears at Kapur-di-Giri (I. 253). Deceived by the divisions introduced into the reproductions of the *Corpus*, which I supposed to depend on positive traces preserved by the rock itself, I connected these words with the 12th edict; but a kind communication from Dr. Kern allows me to rectify this passage so as to leave no further doubt. We must, according to his ingenious conjecture, separate the words in question from the 12th edict and transfer them to the commencement of the 13th, the genitive *-abhisitasa*, being in agreement with *Piyadasisa*. The words in brackets should therefore be struck out from the end of my translation of the 12th (Rock) edict, and the commencement of the 13th should be modified in the following manner :—'In the ninth year of his coronation, the king Piyadasi, dear unto the Dêvas, conquered the immense territory of Kaliṅga.' Now, it will have been seen from my translation, that it was to this conquest, and to the horrors of which it had been the occasion, that the king attributes his religious conversion. We have, therefore, two facts :—(1) that the conversion of the king dated from the *ninth* year of his coronation, and (2) that he only commenced to have the edicts which were inspired by his new opinions engraved in the *thirteenth*. This, I may add, very well agrees with the statement in the 5th edict of Girnâr, according to which the creation of *Dharmamahâmâtras* dates from his *fourteenth* year. Now let us compare the commencement of the edicts of Sahasrâm and of Rûpnâth with these two facts. According to the version of this passage, as corrected by Dr. Oldenberg (*Mahâvagga*, I. p. xxxviii. note, *Zeitschr. der Deutschen Morg. Ges.*, xxxv., 473) the king, who speaks, declares that he had passed 'more than two years and a half after his conversion without showing his zeal actively, but that, at the moment when he was speaking, he had manifested such zeal a year ago.' If we add these figures together, we find, on the one hand, that Piyadasi passed eight years and a fraction, say eight years and a half, after his coronation, before he was converted; and that he was then more than two years and a half, say two years and three-quarters, before giving effective proofs of his religious zeal. This makes an approximate total of eleven years, plus a fraction, of religious coldness: and it was accordingly only in the twelfth or thirteenth year of his reign that his zeal became outwardly manifest. It is exactly at this period that his evidence in the present passage fixes his first religious edicts. This is a coincidence which no one could consider to be accidental, and there follows this important conclusion that, contrary to the doubts expressed in various quarters and to the theory so ably upheld by Dr. Oldenberg (*Zeitschr. der Deutschen Morg. Ges., loc. cit.*) the author of the inscriptions of Sahasrâm and of Rûpnâth was indisputably the same Piyadasi as he who published the rock tables of Girnâr, and the Columnar edicts, and that, in dealing with these inscriptions, we are certainly on Buddhist ground. It follows, moreover, that the edicts of Sahasrâm and of Rûpnâth, belonging, as they do, to the thirteenth year after his coronation, are certainly amongst the first which he had engraved, and probably the very same as those to which he makes allusion in the passage before us.

2. This phrase contains two difficult words. One is *pâpôvâ*, which has been definitely explained by Dr. Kern as equivalent to *prâpnuyât*. With regard to the first, *apahaṭâ*, I think that the learned Leyden professor has been less happy in his suggestions. He takes it as equivalent to *a-prahartâ*, from the verbal noun *prahartar*, with *taṁ* for its direct object. But, besides such a construction, awkward enough under any circumstances, being repugnant to the style of our monuments, it does not give a very satisfactory sense. Not mutilating these edicts is too small a thing to cause one to acquire, as the sequel shows, various virtues. In the first place, I think that the phrase runs down to *-sukhêti*. The *cha*, which in line 6 follows *tatha*, proves that the entire sentence is to be divided into two parallel halves, the former part of each forming the thoughts of the king, marked and completed by an *iti*, the latter being the two verbs *pativêkhâmi*, and *tatha vidahâmi*. This construction makes the explanation of the initial *sê* more simple. It refers necessarily to *lôkê* understood from the preceding *lôkasa*. This being settled, the general sense to be expected from the entire proposition is something to the

effect that, by instructing themselves by these edicts, men will practise certain virtues, and will be happier and better. It appears to me that we shall easily arrive at this translation by taking *apahaṭâ* as the participle absolute, for *apahṛitya* or even *apahṛitvâ* (we might venture to correct the reading to *apahâṭi*, cf. above I. 53, or even to *apahaṭu*). The meaning 'to carry off for one's own appropriation,' which *apa-har* exactly expresses, could, it appears to me, be applied without too great boldness in the king's ideas to the fact that passers-by might carry away in their memories some scraps of his exhortations, and would improve in such and such a way. (The distributive idiom *taṁ-taṁ* will be noticed). In this manner the meaning appears to me to be much more natural.

3. To *atha iyaṁ* corresponds exactly the Pâli idiom *yathayidaṁ*, which is also known in Buddhist Sanskṛit. For the characters *kimaṁkâni*, it is unnecessary to have recourse to the really desperate correction *kâmakâlî*. The conjunction *kâni* is now familiar to us, and the next edict (l. 18) affords another instance of its association with an interrogative pronoun; *kimaṁ* may remain. As observed on a former occasion (I. 18-19) we are authorised to understand it as *kim u*, a common strongly interrogative formula. If we reject this reading, the only other alternative which I see, is to admit that *kiṁ*, degraded to the *rôle* of a simple particle, has in some way doubled its final letter by the addition of a neuter adverbial termination, so that we obtain *kimaṁ*, very much as the Pâli has *sudaṁ* for *svidaṁ*, *i.e. svid*. I must avow my preference for the former solution.

4. A comparison with the 12th (Rock) edict appears to me to fix the meaning of *nikâya* for the present passaṁda. *Nikâyas* form the body of functionaries or royal officers over whom Piyadasi exercises a supervision, the personal character of which we have just seen the 4th (Columnar) edict emphasizing.

5. The 12th (Rock) edict again helps us to arrive at the exact meaning of this last phrase. The obscurity consists in the words *atanâ pachupagamanê*, although the substantive *pachupagamana* does not lend itself to much uncertainty. It can hardly mean anything except the action of approaching with respect, and while we admit that *praṭi* adds a distributive or individual shade of meaning, it can easily be translated as 'personal adherence to.' But what is the relation between the two words? Dr. Kern transcribes the first word as *atana* and sees in it a genitive. In that case we should except *atanê*, but if we pass over this difficulty, the translation which he proposes, 'my own belief' (*mijne eigene belijdenis*) supposes a very peculiar meaning for *pachupagamana*, which is a bold deviation from the etymological sense in a word for which we have no proof of any technical use. In the 12th (Rock) edict, we have a thought altogether analogous to the passage under review:—'Piyadasi . . . . honours all sects . . . . by honours of different kinds.' Then follows a sentence which the particle *tu* at first sight places in a certain antithesis to what precedes:—'But less importance is attached to that than to the desire of seeing their essence (the virtues which constitute their essentials) reign.' Now, here also, the particle *chu* gives a shade of antithesis to the second member of the sentence. If we take the form *atanâ* as correct, and translate literally, we get, 'but it is the personal adherence (to the sects) which I consider as the essential requisite.' The deliberate personal adherence to the doctrines of the various religions is evidently the necessary condition of their *sâravaḍhi*, as the 12th edict expresses it. This explanation, therefore, without touching the text as handed down to us, leads us directly and without violence to a thought which makes a fitting supplement to the idea of the 12th edict. This consideration appears to me to be of such a nature as strongly to recommend it, above all in a text which, like ours, is far from avoiding repetitions, as we shall be better able to judge in dealing with the 8th edict.

TRANSLATION.

Thus saith the King Piyadasi, dear unto the Dêvas:—In the thirteenth year after my coronation did I [for the first time] have edicts engraved for the welfare and happiness of the people. I trust that they will carry away something from them, and thus, in such and such

respects, will make progress in the religion, so that this will be for the welfare and happiness of the people. I also make such arrangements as I believe suited to provide for happiness, whether amongst my distant subjects or amongst those who are near to me and amongst my relations. Hence it is I who watch over the whole body of my officers. All sects receive from me honours of different kinds, but it is the personal adherence [to their doctrines which] I consider to be the essential requisite. In the twenty-seventh year after my coronation had I this edict engraved.

SANSKRIT AND OLD-KANARESE INSCRIPTIONS.

BY J. F. FLEET, Bo.C.S., M.R.A.S., C.I.E.

No. 175.—Bombay Asiatic Society's Copper-Plate Grant of Bhimadeva II. Simha-Samvat 93.

I edit this inscription, which has not previously been published, from the original plates, which I obtained for examination, in 1878, from the Library of the Bombay Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society. I have no information as to where they were found. A lithograph of the inscription will be published hereafter, in *Indian Inscriptions*, No. 17.

The **plates**, which are inscribed on one side only, are two in number; each measuring about $9\frac{1}{4}''$ by $6\frac{1}{8}''$. The edges of them were slightly raised into rims, to protect the writing; and though the surfaces of the plates are a good deal corroded by rust, the inscription is legible, without any points of doubt, throughout. — In the lower part of the first plate, and the upper part of the second, there are holes for two **rings** to connect them. The rings are plain copper rings, each about $\frac{1}{8}''$ thick and $2\frac{3}{8}''$ in diameter. They had both been cut, when the grant came under my notice. There are no indications of a **seal** having been attached to either of them, and abstracted from it. And the seal of this grant, if there was one, is not now forthcoming. — The **characters** are Nâgarî, of the regular type of the period and locality to which the inscription refers itself. They include, in line 1, the **decimal figures** 1, 3, and 9. The average **size of the letters** is about $\frac{5}{16}''$. The engraving is bold and good. — The **language** is Sanskṛit; and the whole record is in prose, except for one benedictive and imprecatory verse quoted in line 13-14. In line 6 we have the **Prâkṛit word** *vachchha*, for the Sanskṛit *vatsa*. — In respect of **orthography**, the only points that call for notice are (1) the constant use of the *anusvâra* instead of the proper nasal, *e.g.* in *maṁḍal-âṁtaḥpâti*, line 3; (2) the use of *v* for *b* throughout, in *vrâhmaṇa*, lines 4 and 8, and in *vôdhayaty*, line 4; and (3) the use of *ś* for *s*, in *śva*, line 3; *nivâśi*, line 4; and *sahaśrâṇi śvargê*, line 13.

The **inscription** is one of **the Chaulukya king Bhîmadêva II. of Aṇhilwâḍ.** It is non-sectarian; the object of it being to record the grant of some land to a Brâhmaṇ.

The **places** mentioned in the inscription are, the city of **Aṇahilapâṭaka**, where Bhîmadêva II. was, when he notified this grant; **Sahasachâṇâ**, the village in which the land granted was situated; **Vêkariyâ**, a village mentioned in defining the boundaries of the land; and **Prasanna-pura**, the town from which the family of the grantee came. And, as we learn from the preamble, **Sahasachâṇâ and Vêkariyâ** are to be looked for in **the Kachchha maṇḍala or province of Kachchha**; which must have been more or less identical with **the modern 'Cutch' State**; and which the record describes as being enjoyed by Bhîmadêva II. himself, as if the province were private property of his, assigned to him apart from the general revenues of the kingdom.

As regards the **date** of this record, in line 1 we have the details of the year 93, in decimal figures, of an unspecified era; the month Chaitra; the bright fortnight; the civil day 11 (and with it the eleventh *tithi*); and Ravi, *i. e.* Râvivâra or **Sunday**. And from line 5 we learn that the grant was made **on that day, at the festival of a saṁkrânti**, which can only be **the Mêsha-Saṁkrânti** or entrance of the Sun into Aries. The era that is quoted, is **the Siṁha era**; which is mentioned under that name in the Verâwal inscription of Arjunadêva of Aṇhilwâḍ,[1]

[1] See *ante*, Vol. XI. p. 242, Text, line 3; and Vol. XVI. p. 147.

dated in Valabhî-Saṁvat 945, and again in No. 176 below. The exact epoch of this era, and the scheme of its years, as also its historical starting-point, have not yet been properly considered. To these points I will revert on another occasion. And meanwhile it is sufficient to state that the month of Chaitra in Siṁha-Saṁvat 93 should be coupled with Vikrama-Saṁvat 1262 or 1263; and that the English equivalent of the given date is to be found in A. D. 1204, 1205, 1206, or 1207, according as the Vikrama year is treated as a northern or as a southern year, and is applied as current or as expired. By Prof. K. L. Chhatre's Tables, I find that—

In northern Vikrama-Saṁvat 1262 current, Chaitra śukla 11 ended on Saturday, 13th March, A.D. 1204, at about 44 *ghaṭîs*, 45 *palas*, after mean sunrise, for Aṇhilwâḍ;[2] eleven days before the Mêsha-Saṁkrânti, which occurred on Wednesday, 24th March, at about 31 *gh.* 37 *p.*

In northern Vikrama-Saṁvat 1263 current (1262 expired) and southern Vikrama-Saṁvat 1262 current, Chaitra śukla 11 ended on Friday, 1st April, A.D. 1205, at about 47 *gh.* 58 *p.*; seven days after the Mêsha-Saṁkrânti, which occurred on Thursday, 24th March, at about 47 *gh.* 8 *p.*

In northern Vikrama-Saṁvat 1264 current (1263 expired) and southern Vikrama-Saṁvat 1263 current, Chaitra śukla 11 ended on Wednesday, 22nd March, A.D. 1206, at about 29 *gh.* 52 *p.*; three days before the Mêsha-Saṁkrânti, which occurred on Saturday, 25th March, at about 2 *gh.* 40 *p.*, and would be celebrated on the same day.

And finally, **in southern Vikrama-Saṁvat 1264 current (1263 expired), Chaitra śukla 11** ended, as required, on **Sunday,** 11th March, A.D. 1207, at about 59 *gh.* 5 *p.* But this was **fourteen days before the Mêsha-Saṁkrânti, which occurred on Sunday, 25th March,** at about 18 *gh.* 11 *p.*, and would be celebrated on that day. This calculation, of course, is for the *nirayaṇa* or non-precessional *saṁkrânti.* And the discrepancy cannot be adjusted by assuming that this record intends to quote the *sâyana* or precessional *saṁkrânti*; for, the *sâyana* Mêsha-Saṁkrânti occurred, roughly, either very late on Tuesday, 13th March, or very early on Wednesday, 14th March. There seems, therefore, no room for doubting that **this day, Sunday, 25th March, A.D. 1207, is the one that is intended.** But the *tithi* which ended on this day, at about 55 *gh.* 58 *p.*, was the eleventh *tithi* of the *dark* fortnight of Chaitra, by the *amânta* arrangement, which is the proper one for this locality and period. And, to reconcile the results, **we must assume a genuine mistake in the preparation of the record**; and, though *śu*, 'the bright fortnight,' is distinctly the reading in the text, we must alter it into *ba*, 'the dark fortnight.'

TEXT.[3]

First Plate.

1 Ôm[4] Râjâvalî pûrvva-vat || **Saṁvat 93 Chaitra śu di 11 Ravau**
ady=ôha śrîmad-A-

2 **ṇahilapâṭakê** samasta - râjâvalî - virâjita - mahârâjâdhirâja - śrî-

3 **Bhîmadêvaḥ** śva(sva)-bhujyamâna-**Kachchha**-maṁḍal-âṁtaḥpâti-samasta-
râjapurushâ-

4 n vrâ(brâ)hmaṇ-ôttarân taṁ(n)-nivâśi(si)-janapadâ[ṁ*]ś=cha vô(bô)dhayaty=
Astu vaḥ saṁviditaṁ

5 yathâ || **Adya saṁkrâṁti-parvvaṇi** char-âchara-guruṁ bhagavaṁtaṁ
Bhavânî-patim=abhya-

6 rchya saṁsârasy=âsâratâṁ vichiṁtya **Prasaṁnna**[5]**pura-sthâna-vinirgatâyaḥ**[6]
Vachchha(tsa)-sa-

---

[2] The times here are for Aṇhilwâḍ, all through.
[3] From the original plates.
[4] Represented by a symbol.
[5] Read *prasanna.*
[6] Read *vinirgatâya.*

7 gôtrâya Dâmôdara-suta-Gôviṁdâya **Sahasachâṇâ-grâmê**[7] vâpî-puṭakê bhûmi-halavâh[â*] 1

8 êkâ śulkêna sahâ(ha) śâsanê pradattâ [॥*] Asyâś=cha pûrvvatô vrâ(brâ)hmaṇa-Dâmô-

9 dara-satka-vâpî dakshiṇatô **Vêkariyâ**-kshêtra[ṁ*] paśchimê mahaṁ[9]-Kêśa-

Second Plate.

10 va-satka-vâpî uttaratô mârgaḥ iti chatur-âghâṭ-ôpalakshitâ[9] ॥ Bhû-

11 mim=ênâm=avagamya asmadu(d)-vaṁśa-jair=anyair=api bhâvi-bhôktṛibhiḥ a-

12 smat-pradattâḥ[10] va(dha)rma-dâyô=[ya*]m=anumaṁtavyaḥ pâlanîyaś=cha ॥ Uktaṁ cha bhagava-

13 tâ Vyâsêna [।*] Shavyir[11]-vvarva[12]-sahaśrâ(srâ)ṇi śva(sva)rgê tishṭa(shṭha)ti bhûmi-daḥ âchchhêttâ

14 ch=ânumaṁtâ cha tâṁny[13]=êva nacha(ra)kaṁ vasêt ॥ Likhitam=idaṁ kâyastha-

15 Kâṁchana-suta-Vaṭêśvarêṇa ॥ Dûtakô=tra na(ma)hâsâṁdhivigrahika-śrî-

16 **Chaṁḍaśarmmaḥ(rmmâ)** ॥ Śrî-**Bhîmadêvasya**[14] ॥

ABSTRACT OF CONTENTS.

After the words "the line of kings (*is*) as on previous occasions," which refer to the full genealogy as given in, for instance, No. 176 below, the inscription proceeds to record that: — **In the year 93 (line 1), in the month Chaitra, in the bright fortnight, on the civil day 11, and on Sunday, to-day,** and here at the famous (**city of**) **Aṇahilapâṭaka,** the *Mahârâjâdhirâja,* the glorious **Bhîmadêva (II.)** (l. 3), informs all the king's servants, and the people, headed by the Brâhmaṇs, in **the Kachchha maṇḍala,** which is being enjoyed by himself:—

"Be it known to you (l. 4) that **to-day, at the festival of a saṁkranti** (l. 5), having done worship to (Śiva) the divine lord of Bhavânî, the father of all things animate and inanimate, one plough (*halavâhâ*) of land, in the hollow ground below an irrigation-well (*vâpîputaka*), at **the village of Sahasachâṇâ** (l. 7), is given by this charter, to Gôvinda, the son of Dâmôdara, of the Vatsa *gôtra,* who came from **the locality of Prasannapura.**

"The boundaries of this land (l. 8) are: — On the east, an irrigation-well in the holding (*satka*) of the Brâhmaṇ Dâmôdara; on the south, the fields of the **(the village of) Vêkariyâ;**[15] on the west, an irrigation-tank in the holding of the *Mahattara,* or *Mahattama,* Kêśava; and on the north, a road.

"[In lines 11 to 14, the grantor gives an injunction to future rulers, to continue this grant; and quotes one of the customary benedictive and imprecatory verses, which is allotted to the venerable Vyâsa. And his speech apparently ends with the word *vasêt,* in line 14.]"

Lines 14 to 16 record that the charter was written by the Kâyastha Vaṭêśvara, the son of Kâñchana; and that the *Dûtaka* was the *Mahâsâṁdhivigrahika* **Chaṇḍaśarman.**

And the inscription ends with the words "of the glorious **Bhîmadêva;**" referring to his sign-manual, which is supposed to be attached here.

No. 176.—ROYAL ASIATIC SOCIETY'S COPPER-PLATE GRANT OF THE TIME OF BHIMADEVA II. VIKRAMA-SAMVAT 1266, AND SIMHA-SAMVAT 96.

This inscription again, which has not previously been published, I edit from the original plates, which I obtained for examination, in 1879, from the Library of the Royal Asiatic

[7] This word, *sahaschâṇâ-grâmê,* was omitted here, and stands below line 9, with marks at both places to indicate its proper position in the Text.

[8] i. e. *mahattara,* or *mahattama.* Instead of using the *anusvâra,* the word would more properly have been written *maha°.*

[9] Read *âghâṭâ upalakshitâḥ.* [10] Read *pradattô.* [11] Metre, Ślôka (Anushṭubh).

[12] Read *shashṭi-varsha.* [13] Read *tâny.* [14] The words *sva-hastô-yaṁ* are understood here.

[15] This village-name still exists in the Sôrath Prânt of Kâṭhiâwâd, in the Mahî-Kâṇṭhâ State, and in the Viramgaum Tâlukâ of the Ahmadâbâd District. Also, the names of Vêkra and Vêkrâ exist in Kachchh.

Society. I have no information as to where they were found. A lithograph of the inscription will be published hereafter, in *Indian Inscriptions*, No. 11.

The **plates**, of which the first and the last are inscribed on one side only, are three in number; each measuring about $11\frac{3}{16}''$ by $7\frac{5}{8}''$. They are quite smooth; the edges of them being neither fashioned thicker, nor raised into rims. But they are in an excellent state of preservation; and the inscription is perfectly legible throughout. The plates are numbered, in the margin after the end of the writing on the first and third plates, and on the second side of the second plate.—In the lower part of the first plate, and the upper part of the other two, there are holes for a **ring** to connect them. The ring is a plain copper ring, about $\frac{5}{16}''$ thick and $2\frac{1}{2}''$ in diameter. It had been cut when the grant came under my notice. There are no indications of a **seal** having been attached to it, and abstracted from it. And the seal of this grant, if there was one, is not now forthcoming.—The **characters** are Nâgarî, of the regular type of the period and locality to which the inscription refers itself. They include in lines 2 and 29, and in the numbering of the plates, the **decimal figures** 1 to 6, and 9. The average **size of the letters** is about $\frac{1}{4}''$; but it is not preserved very uniformly. The engraving is good and clear. — The **language** is Sanskṛit; and the whole record is in prose, except for one benedictive and imprecatory verse quoted in line 47-48. There are a good many mistakes; but, curiously enough, in mentioning Nâgârjuna, the king of Kâvi, in line 17, this inscription supplies a satisfactory reading, which has not been found in the previously published grants of this dynasty. The text contains, in lines 2, 3, 23 ff., many **abbreviated words**, not all of which are recognisable; and in some instances, as in *suta°*, *paṁḍita°*, and *śrêshṭi°*, in lines 52-54, the mark of abbreviation seems to be used unnecessarily. It also contains some **words that require explanation**; *pallaḍiká*, in line 43; *kasthaka*,[1] in line 55, which probably stands for *kachchhaka*, since in line 43 we have *kachhaka*[2] or more properly *kachchhaka*; and *vahaṇi*, in lines 35, 38, 41, 42, which, from the mention in line 41 of "the *vahaṇi* of the village (of Bhûharaḍâ)" and in line 41-42 of "the *vahaṇi* of (the village of) Sîvalîyâ," seems to be not a village-name, as otherwise it might have been understood.—In respect of **orthography**, the only points that call for notice are (1) the constant use of the *anusvâra* instead of the proper nasal, *e.g.* in *châmuṁḍa*, line 6; *âvaṁtî*, line 10; and *raṇâṁgaṇa*, line 12; (2) the omission, throughout, to double consonants after *r*, except in *karṇṇa*, line 9; *dharmmêṇa*, line 44; and *dharmmârtha*, line 48; and (3) the use of *v* for *b* throughout, in *prativaddha*, line 28; *vrahmajâ*, line 50; and *vrahmapurîya* and *vrâhmaṇa*, line 52.

The **inscription** refers itself to **the reign of the Chaulukya king Bhîmadêva II. of Aṇhilwâḍ**. But the charter contained in it refers only to certain arrangements made by some subordinate persons. The inscription is non-sectarian; the object of it being to record some grants of land for the maintenance of an irrigation-well and a watering-trough attached to it.

The **places** mentioned in this inscription, in addition to **Aṇahilapâṭaka**, or, as the name is written here and in some other records, **Aṇahillapâṭaka**, at which city the record was drawn up in writing, are, **Ghaṇṭelâṇâ**, the village in which were situated the irrigation-well and the watering-trough; the villages of **Âkavalîyâ**, **Bhûharaḍâ**, **Sâkalî**, **Samaḍîyâ**, **Sîvalîyâ**, and **Varaḍi**, and the river **Sôshaḍî**, mentioned in connection with the details of the grants; **the village or hamlet of Brahmapurî**, mentioned in the list of witnesses; and **Dharmavarhikâ**, apparently a town or village, at which place the written charter was delivered by the *Dûtaka*, and was engrossed on copper-plates. And the neighbourhood in which they are to be found, is indicated by the mention, in the preamble, of **the Surâshṭrâḥ maṇḍala**, which is **the modern province of Kâṭhiâwâḍ**, and of **the city of Vâmanasthalî**, which is **the modern**

[1] *chchh* is frequently represented by *sth*. But it must be noted that the proper *chchh* is used in *gachchhamâna*, line 38.

[2] This, at least, is the word that I think is intended. But the sign which I interpret here as *chh*, and which does represent *chh* in *gachchhamâna*, line 38, is used for *th* in *sthânâ*, line 51 and other places; though not in *atrârthâ*, line 49. It also occurs in *chhêḍa*, line 52, where it is rather differently formed; and in *machhitya* (unless we should here read *mathitya*) by mistake for *maṭhêtya*, line 50.

Wanthali[3] in the Junâgaḍh State in Kâṭhiâwâḍ. **Dharmavarhikâ**, however, may possibly be another name of **Aṇhilwaḍ itself.** Of the places mentioned in the genealogical passage, **Avanti** is another name of **Ujjain**, in Mâlwa; **Sâkaṁbharî** is supposed to be **the modern Sambhar or Sâmbhar**, in the Jaipur State, Râjputânâ (*ante*, Vol. VIII. p. 59, note 6; and Vol. X. p. 161); **the Sapâdalaksha country** has been identified by Dr. Bhagwanlal Indraji with **the region of the Sivâlik Hills**, in the Pañjâb (*ante*, Vol. X. p. 345); and **Kâvi** is evidently **the modern Kâvi**, in the Broach District.

The **date** of this record, in lines 1 to 4, is given fully in words and in decimal figures; and the details are Vikrama-Saṁvat 1266, not distinctly specified either as current or as expired,[4] and Siṁha-Saṁvat 96; the month Mârga, *i.e.* Mârgaśîrsha; the bright fortnight; the fourteenth *tithi* and civil day; and Gurudina or **Thursday.** And the English equivalent is to be found in A.D. 1208 or 1209, according as the given Vikrama year, whether referred to the northern or to the southern reckoning of the era, is to be taken as current or as expired. By Prof. K. L. Chhatre's Tables, I find that —

In (northern and) southern Vikrama-Saṁvat 1266, current, Mârgaśîrsha śukla 14 ended on Sunday, 23rd November, A.D. 1208, at about 5 *ghaṭîs*, 58 *palas*, after mean sunrise, for Aṇhilwâḍ.

And in **(northern and) southern Vikrama-Saṁvat 1267 current (1266 expired), Mârgasîrsha śukla 14 ended, as required, on Thursday, 12th November, A.D. 1209,** at about 22 *gh.* 31 *p.* And this, therefore, is the proper English equivalent of the given date.

TEXT.[5]

First Plate.

1 **Ôm**[6] Svasti **Śrîmad-Vikrama-nṛipa-kâl-âtîta-saṁvatsara**[7]**-śatêshu dvâdaśasu shaṭa shashṭy**[8]**=âdhikê-**

2 **shu laukika**°[9] **Mârgga-mâsasya śukla-paksha-chaturdaśyâṁ Guru-dinê atr=âṁkatôḥ=pi**[10] **śrî-**

3 **Vikrama-saṁvat 1266 varshê śrî-Siṁha-saṁvat 96 varshê lauki**° **Mârgga śu di**[11] **14 Gurâv=a-**

4 syâṁ saṁvatsara-mâsa-paksha-dina-vâra-pûrvâyâṁ tithâv=ady=êha śrîmad-**Aṇahilla-pâṭakê** sama-

5 sta - râjâvalî - virâjita - paramabhaṭṭâraka - mahârâjâdhirâja - paramêśvara - śrî - **Mûlarâja-**

6 **dêva** - pâd - ânudhyâta - paramabhaṭṭâraka - mahârâjâdhirâja - paramêśvara-śrî-**Châmu-[ṁ*]-ḍa râjadêva-**

7 pâd - ânudhyâta - paramabhaṭṭâraka - mahârâjâdhirâja - paramêśvara - śrî - **Durlabharâja-dêva**-pâd-â-

8 nudhyâta-paramabhaṭṭâraka-mahârâjâdhirâja-paramêśvara-śrî**Bhîmadêva**-pâd-ânudhyâta-pa-

9 ramabhaṭṭâraka-mahârâjâdhirâja-paramêśvara-**Trailôkyamalla**-śrî- **Karṇṇadêva** - pâd - ânu-

10 dhyâta-paramabhaṭṭâraka-mahârâjâdhirâja-paramêśvar - **Âvaṁtînâtha** - **Varvaraka** - jishṇu-**Siddhacha-**

11 **kravartti**-śrîmaj-[**J***]**ayasiṁhadêva**-pâd- ânudhyâta - paramabhaṭṭâraka - mahârâjâdhirâja-paramê-

---

[3] The 'Banthly, Vanathali, Vanthli, and Wanthali,' of maps, &c. Indian Atlas, Sheet No. 13, Lat. 21° 28′ N.; Long. 70° 22′ E.

[4] The expression that is used is analogous to one of constant use for the Śaka era, on which I have commented, *ante*, Vol. XVII. p. 119 f.

[5] From the original plates.

[6] Represented by a symbol; so also at the end; but the symbol there is not the same as here.

[7] This letter, *ra*, was omitted: and was then inserted above the line, with a mark, which has run into the following *śa*, to indicate the omission.

[8] Read *shaṭ-shashṭy*.

[9] This word, with the mark attached to it, seems to stand for some such expression as *laukika-gaṇanayâ*.

[10] Read *âṁkatô=pi*.

[11] The form that is used here for *d*, might ordinarily represent *ḍh*. Almost the same form occurs in the second syllable of *dvâdaśasu*, line 1.

12 śvara-praudhapratâpa- Chaturbhujavikrama - raṇâṁgaṇa - vijita - **Ṇakaṁrarî**[12]**bhûpâla** - śrî-
13 **Kum[â*]rapâladêva** - pâd - ânudhyâta - paramabhaṭṭâraka - mahârâjâdhirâja - paramêśva-
14 ra-Kalikâla-nikva(shka)laṁk- âvatârita - Rânva(na) - râjya - prâptâ(pta) - karadîkṛita - **Sapâ-**

Second Plate; First Side.

15 **dalaksha - Lakshmâpâla** - śrîmad[13] - **Ajayapâladêva** - pâd - ânudhyâta - paramabha-
16 ṭṭâraka - mahârâjâdhirâja - paramêśvara - paramabhaṭṭâraka[14] - âhava[15] - parâ-
17 bhûta - durjaya - **Nâgârjuna - Kâvirâja**[16] - **śrî - Mûlarâjadêva** - pâd - ânudhyâ-
18 ta - paramabhaṭṭâraka - mahârâjâdhirâja - paramêśvar - **Âbhinava - Siddharâja-**
19 **dêva** - Vôla[17] - Nârâyaṇ - âvatâra - śrî - **Bhîmadêva** - kalyâṇa - vijaya - râjyê [1*]
20 Tat - pâdapadm - ôpajîvini mahâmâtya - śrî - **Ratanapâlê** śrî - śrîkaraṇ - â-
21 dau samasta-mudrâ-vyâpârân=upari-paṁthayat=îty=êvaṁ kâlê pravarttamânê
22 asya prabhôḥ prasâd-âvâpta-pattalayâ[18] bhujyamâna-śrî **Surâshṭrâ**-maṁḍalê
23 mahâ°-prati°[19]-śrî-**Sômarâjadêvê** kṛi(ta)n-niyukta-**Vâmanasthal**-śrîka-
24 raṇê maham°[20]-śrî-Sô(Śô)bhanadêva-prabhṛiti-paṁcha-kula-pratipattau śâsanam=a-
25 bhilikhyatê yathâ । Prâgvâṭ - jñâtîya[21]- maham° - Vâlaharâ - suta - maham°-

Second Plate; Second Side.

26 Mahipâlêna **Ghaṁṭelâṇâ**-grâmê dakshiṇa-diśu(śâ)-bhâgê kârâpit[â*] vâpî tathâ
27 prapâyâṁ cha saṁjâta-bharitâyâṁ tithau Nâgara-jñâtîya-du°[22]-Pârâsa(śa)ra-suta-du°-
28 Mâdhavâya **Ghaṁṭelâṇâ**-grâmê vâpî-prativa(ba)ddha-kshêtraṁ bhûmi-pâśa-vṛi°[23] saṁkhyâ-
29 yâṁ pâśa 50 paṁchâśata(t) pâśâ[ḥ*] । asy=âghâṭâ [yathâ*] । pûrvatô jyô°[24]-Sumachaṁḍa-kshêtra[ṁ*] ।
30 tathâ **Sôshaḍî**-nâma-nadî sîmâ[1*] dakshiṇatô=pi **Sôshaḍî**-nâma-nadî sîmâ । paśchima-
31 tô râu°[25]-Vêdagarbha-sakta(tka)-kshêtra[ṁ*] sîmâ । uttaratô râja-mârgga[ḥ*] sîmâ ।(॥) Tathâ prapâ-kshê-
32 traṁ dvitîyaṁ tathâ grâmê ut[t*]ara-diśâyâṁ vâ[ya*]vya-kôṇ-âśrita-bhûmi-pâśa-vṛi° saṁkhyâ-
33 yâṁ pâśa 100 śataṁ=êkaṁ । asya cha âghâṭâ yathâ । pûrvatô râjakîya-bhûmî śîmâ ।
34 dakshiṇatô Môha°[26]-Sôlûyâ-kshêtra-bhûmî sîmâ । paśchimatô **Bhûharaḍâ**-grâma-sîmâ-
35 yâṁ sîmâ । ut[t*]aratô vahaṇi-sîmâyâṁ sîmâ ।(॥) Tathâ **Âkavalîyâ**-grâmê grâmât
36 ut[t*]ara-diśi(śâ)-bhâgê bhûmi-khaṁḍa 1 saṁkhyâyâṁ vṛi° pâśa 100 śataṁ=êkaṁ । asya cha
37 âghâṭâ [yathâ*] । pûrvvatô **Sâkalî**-grâma-sîmâyâṁ sîmâ । dakshiṇatô **Varaḍî**-sîmâ । pa-
38 śchimatô **Ghaṁṭelâṇâ**-grâmasy=ôpari gachchhamâna-mârgga[ḥ*] sîmâ । ut[t*]aratô vahaṇi-sîmâ [11*]
39 Tatha **Bhûharaḍâ**-grâmô(mê)=pi bhûmi-kha[ṁ*]ḍa 1 saṁkhyâyâṁ vṛi° pâśa 100 śataṁ=êkaṁ । asya

---

[12] Read *śâkaṁbharî*. [13] See page 83 above, note 12.

[14] This title has already occurred, and is unnecessarily repeated here.

[15] Read *bhaṭṭârak-âhava*; subject, however, to the preceding note.

[16] In the grant of Vikrama-Saṁvat 1263, *ante*, Vol. VI. p. 194, line 10-11, and elsewhere, Dr. Bühler's published reading and translation are *garjjanak-âdhirâja*, 'the ruler of the Garjanakas.' The reading given by me is quite distinct in the present grant.

[17] This should probably be corrected into *vâla* for *bâla*. Perhaps the mark before the *vâ*, which turns it into *vî*, is only due to a slip of the engraver's tool.

[18] We should probably correct this into *pattalâyâṁ*. But it is possible that the word is here used in a different sense, and that the instrumental case is correct; the meaning then being "in the province of Surâshṭrâḥ *maṇḍala*, which is being enjoyed by him under a patent obtained through the favour of his lord."

[19] It is doubtful whether we have here the abbreviation of one official title, *mahâpratîhâra*; or whether two titles, such as *mahâmâtya-pratîhâra*, are intended.

[20] i.e. *mahattara* or *mahattama*. [21] Read *prâgvâḍ-jñâtîya*.

[22] Or perhaps *û°*, or possibly *hu°*; so also in lines 45-46. I do not know what the abbreviation stands for.

[23] i.e. *vṛittiḥ*, or *vṛittaṁ*. [24] *i.e.*, probably, *jyôtisha*.

[25] i.e. *râuta*. [26] *i.e.*, possibly, *mêhara*.

Third Plate.

40 cha âghâṭâ [yathâ*] । pûrvatô **Ghaṁṭelâṇâ**-grâma-sîmâyâṁ sîmâ । dakshiṇatô **Samaḍîyâ**-grâma sî-

41 mây[â*]ṁ [sîmâ*] । paschimatô tathâ grâmîya-vahaṇi-sîmâyâṁ sîmâ । ut[t*]aratô **Sîvalîyâ**-

42 vahaṇi-sîmâyâ[ṁ*] sîmâ । êvaṁ chatur-âghâṭa-viśuddhâ bhûmî sva-sîmâ-paryaṁta[ṁ*] ya-

43 thâ-prasiddha-paribhôjyâ gṛihâṇâ[ṁ*] pallaḍikâ-samêtâ khalaka-ka[ch*]chhaka-bhûmî

44 sahitâḥ[27] a-karâ nirmalâ gôpatha-gôprachâra-samêtâ udaka-pûrva-dharmmêṇa prada-

45 ttâ ।(॥) Êshâ vâpî tathâ prapâ cha du°-Mâdhavêna sad=aiva bharaṇîyâ । vâpî[ṁ*] tathâ prapâ[ṁ*] cha

46 du°-Mâdhavêna bharamâṇêna satâ êshâ bhûmî sha(kha)ṁḍa-chatushṭaya-saṁkhyâkâ â-chaṁ-

47 dr-ârka-kâlaṁ yâvata(t) saṁtâna-paraṁparayâ bhôktavyâ bhôktâraṇîyâś=cha[28] ॥ Jânîhi[29] dattâni

48 purâ naraiṁdrai dânâni[30] dharmm-ârtha-yasa(śa)s-karâṇi । nimâlya-vaṁtê[31]-pratimâni tâni kô nâma

49 sâdhu[ḥ*] punar=âdadîta[32] ॥ Atr=ârthê sâkshi ॥ Vâma[33]-śrî-Sômanâthadêvîya-sthânâ°[34]-Durvâsu ॥ Śrî-

50 Visaḍhêśvaradêva-machhi(ṭhê)tya-sthânâ(na)pati-Vimvalaja ॥ Śrî-Kêdâra-maṭhêtya-sthânâ°-Vra(bra)hmajâ । Dê-

51 vî-śrî-Kapâlêśvarî-stâ(sthâ)nîya-sthânâ°-Kshadajâ sthâna°-yô°[35]-Lâshâ-suta-yô°-Vêdâ Î(?)kshâ Â-

52 lâ-suta-Î(?)kshâ Sâvadêva । **Vra(bra)hmapurîya-Î(?)kshâ** । Disikêsi-suta°-Î(?)kshâ°[36] Chhêḍâ । Tathâ vrâ(brâ)hmaṇa-

53 Mada(dhu)sûdana-suta-paṁḍita°-Sômaravi mahâjana-Môḍha śrêshṭi°[37]-Nâna-suta°-śrêshṭi°-Sûmâ । Kalya°-śrê-

54 shṭi°-Khêtâ । Prâgvâ°[38]-śrêshṭi-Dharaṇiga śrêshṭi°-Kudâ-suta°-Gâṁgadêva । Gûrja°[39]-mahâjana-śr[ê*]shṭi-

55 Yajakô ॥ Kûpaṁ khalakaṁ kastha(chchha)kaṁ gô-pathaṁ gô-prachâraṁ bhôktavyaṁ cha ॥ Dûtakaḥ[40] svayaṁ ॥ **Dharmavarhi-**

56 **kâyâṁ** saṁcharitaṁ ch=âjñâtaṁ ॥ Chha ॥ Śrîḥ ॥ Ôm ॥

ABSTRACT OF CONTENTS.

The inscription commences with the date, **in twelve centuries, increased by sixty-six (years), of the years that have gone by from the time of the glorious king Vikrama, and, by the popular reckoning, on the fourteenth tithi of the bright fortnight of the month Mârga, on Thursday; or, in figures the Vikrama year 1266, in (this) year, the Siṁha year 96, in (this) year, by the popular reckoning, (the month) Mârga, the bright fortnight, the (civil) day 14, on Thursday;** on this *tithi*, (*specified*) as above by the year, month, fortnight, (civil) day, and week-day; **to-day;** here at the famous **(city of) Aṇahillapâṭaka** (line 4).[41] And it then gives the following genealogy :—

The *Paramabhaṭṭâraka, Mahârâjâdhirâja*, and *Paramêśvara*, the glorious **Mûlarâjadêva (I.)** (l. 5). His successor (*pâd-ânudhyâta*) was the *P. M. P.*, the glorious **Châmuṇḍarâjadêva**

[27] Read *sahitâ*. [28] What was intended to be the reading here, is not apparent.
[29] Metre, Indravajrâ.—The usual reading here is *yân=îha*. But there is no inherent objection to the present reading, which is the 2nd pers. sing. imper. par. [30] Read *narêṁdrair=dânâni*.
[31] Read *nirmâlya-vâṁta*. [32] First *na* was engraved here; and then it was corrected into *ta*.
[33] Here *vâma* is perhaps an abbreviation for *vâmanasthali*.
[34] i.e. *sthânâdhikâri*; or else *sthânâpati*, for *sthânapati*, as in the next line. [35] *i.e.*, perhaps, *yôgin*.
[36] The mark of abbreviation here seems to be a mistake.
[37] Here, and in the following instances, read *śrêshṭhi°*.
[38] i.e. *prâgvâṭ*. [39] i.e. *gûrjara*; or more properly *gurjara*.
[40] This *visarga* is imperfect; only the lower part of it having been formed.
[41] The context is "a charter is written, to the following effect," in line 25. And this, with the wording of line 55-56, suggests the possibility of Dharmavarhikâ being another name of Aṇhilwâḍ.

(l. 6). His successor was the *P. M. P.*, the glorious **Durlabharâjadêva** (l. 7). His successor was the *P. M. P.*, the glorious **Bhîmadêva (I.)** (l. 8). His successor was the *P. M. P.*, the glorious **Karṇadêva**, who had the *biruda* or secondary name of **Trailôkyamalla** (l. 9). His successor was the *P. M P.*, the glorious **Jayasiṁhadêva** (l. 11), who was **victorious over the lord of Avanti and over the Varvarakas**, and who had the *biruda* of **Siddhachakravartin** (l. 10). His successor was the *P. M. P.*, the glorious **Kumârapâladêva** (l. 13), who was equal in prowess to the god Chaturbhuja (Vishṇu), and **who conquered in battle the king of Sâkaṁbharî** (l. 12). His successor was the *P. M. P.*, the glorious **Ajayapâladêva** (l. 15); who reproduced in this Kali age the spotless reign of Râma; and **who levied tribute from Lakshmâpâla, (the king) of the Sapâdalaksha (country).** His successor was the *P. M. P.*, the glorious **Mularâjadêva (II.)** (l. 17); **who overcame in war Nâgârjuna, the king of Kâvi**, difficult to be conquered. And his successor is the *P. M. P.*, the glorious **Bhîmadêva (II.)** (l. 19); who has the *biruda* of **Abhinava-Siddharâjadêva**, and who is a very incarnation of (the god) Bâla-Nârâyaṇa (Vishṇu).

In the reign of the last-mentioned king (l. 19), and while his feudatory (*pâdapadm-ôpajîvin*) the *Mahâmâtya*, the illustrious **Ratanapâla** (l. 20), is superintending all the functions connected with the royal seal in the records (*śrîkaraṇa*) and other departments; and while, in the district[42] (*pattalâ*) that he acquired through the favour of his lord, *viz.* **in the province of Surâshṭrâḥ maṇḍala** which is being enjoyed by him (l. 22), his deputy in the records-department at **(the city of) Vâmanasthalî** is the *Mahâpratîhâra* (?), the illustrious **Sômarâjadêva** (l. 23); with the consent (?) (*pratipatti*) of the five families headed by (*that of*) the *Mahattara*, or *Mahattama*, the illustrious Śôbhanadêva, a charter is written, to the following effect (l. 25):—

"By Mahipâla, the son of Vâlaharâ, of the Prâgvâṭ kindred, there has been made an irrigation-well (*vâpî*) at **the village of Ghaṇṭelâṇâ** (l. 26), in the southern part of it; and also a watering-trough (*prapâ*). And to Mâdhâva, the son of Pârâśara, of the Nâgara kindred, there has been given an allotment of land, consisting of a field connected with the irrigation-well at the village of **Ghaṇṭelâṇâ** (l. 28), and measuring fifty chains (*pâśa*) (l. 29). Its boundaries are:—On the east, the field of Sumachaṇḍa, and **the river Sôshaḍî** (l. 30); on the south also, **the river Sôshaḍî**; on the west, the field which is the holding (*satka*) of the *Râuta* Vêdagarbha; and on the north, the king's highway.

"Also (l. 31), in the northern part of the village, there is given a second field, for the watering-trough, situated in the north-west corner, and measuring one hundred *pâśas* (l. 33). Its boundaries are:—On the east, the king's land, or the land of the king's servants; on the south, the field of the Môhara (?) Sôlûyâ; and on the west, the boundary of **the village of Bhûharaḍâ** (l. 34); while, on the north, the boundary is at the boundary of the *vahaṇi*.

"So also, in **the village of Âkavalîyâ** (l. 35), in the northern part, there is given land producing one 'candy' (*khaṇḍa*) (of grain), and measuring one hundred *pâśas* (l. 36). Its boundaries are:—On the east, the boundary of **the village of Sâkalî** (l. 37); on the south, the boundary of **(the village of) Varaḍi**; on the west, the road that goes over **the village of Ghaṇṭelâṇâ** (l. 38); and on the north, the *vahaṇi*.

"So also in **the village of Bhûharaḍâ** (l. 39), there is given land producing one *khaṇḍa*, and measuring one hundred *pâśas*. Its boundaries are:—On the east, the boundary of **the village of Ghaṇṭelâṇâ** (l. 40); on the south, the boundary of **the village of Samaḍîyâ**; on the west, the boundary of the *vahaṇi* of the village; and on the north, the boundary of the *vahaṇi* of **(the village of) Sîvalîyâ** (l. 41).

"This irrigation-well and watering-trough (l. 45) are to be always maintained by Mâdhava. And, as long as they are maintained, he and his descendants are to enjoy this land yielding four *khaṇḍas*.[43]

---

[42] See note 18 above.

[43] The total measurement of the four allotments, however, was three hundred and fifty *pâśas*; and in the last two instances one hundred *pâśas* are stated to yield one *khaṇḍa*; so that the total yield should apparently be onl three and a half *khaṇḍas*.

"[Then follows, in line 47, one of the customary benedictive and imprecatory verses. After this, there is given a list of the witnesses to the grant, which includes the names of Durvâsu, the *Sthânâdhikârin*, or *Sthânapati*, of the god Sômanâtha[44] (l. 49); Vimvalaja, the *Sthânapati* of the *maṭha* of the god Visadhêśvara (l. 50); Brahmajâ, the *Sthânâdhikârin*, or *Sthânapati*, of the *maṭha* of the god Kêdâra (l. 50); Kshadajâ, the *Sthânâdhikârin*, or *Sthânapati*, of the shrine of the goddess Kapâlêśvarî (l. 51); Îkshâ(?), of the village or hamlet of Brahmapurî (l. 52); the Prâgvâṭ *Śrêshṭhin* Dharaṇiga (l. 54); and the Gûrjara *Mahâjana* and *Śrêshṭhin* Yajakê (l. 55)].

"The well, the threshing-floor (*khalaka*), the *kasthaka* or *kachchhaka*, the cattle-path, and the pasturage, are to be enjoyed (l. 55). The *Dûtaka* is himself; *i.e.* perhaps Sômarâjadêva. And the command (*âjñâta*) has been communicated or carried into effect (*sancharita*), — *i.e.* the order has been delivered by the *Dûtaka*, and the written charter has been engrossed on copper-plates, — at Dharmavarhikâ (l. 55)."

SOMALI AS A WRITTEN LANGUAGE.

BY MAJOR J. S. KING, Bo.S.C.

(*Continued from Vol.* XVII. *p.* 50.)

No. IV.

COLLOQUIAL SENTENCES.

English.	*Somâli.*
51.—Do you want this?	ادگ وَه مدونيس
52.—I do not want this.	انگ وَه دوني مايو
53.—Salt is very dear at Berbera.	اَوسبوَ هدَ بربره وَكو گنَع ادگ ڢهي
54.—Rice is very cheap at Mokha.	مخا بريس وَكو گنَع جبَن يهى
55.—To whom do these sheep belong?	ادگن ايا ليه
56.—Last night a buggalow arrived from Mokha.	هالى دوني مخاهگي كَتمي
57.—Two hundred camels arrived to-day.	مانَ لَبَ بَغَل اوَر بسوع گَلي
58.—Are there any wells here?	ميشَن عيل مَكو جرَ
59.—Is there any danger from the natives?	ميشَن دَدَگ مَلگ آبسودَ
60.—What is the matter with you? (*lit.* What has got to you?)	مها كو هيلى
61.—Are you sick?	مَياد بوكَتَ or ادگ مَبوكَتَ
62.—Put these things in a basket.	غَلَبگ كولينگي كو رِدَ

[44] Perhaps "the god Sômanâtha of Vâmanasthalî;" see note 33 above.

63.—Come quickly.	دقسو كالے
64.—I sent for you: why did you not come? (*lit.* Why were you not found come?)	انگ كو ييدي مهاد امن وثدي
65.—He killed him with a spear.	اسگ ورنب كو دلى
66.—He struck him in the back with a spear.	اسگ ڏبوك ورنب كو وريمى
67.—I am afraid to go there.	هگ اثن تگو بان كبغى
68.—I will give you eight dollars for this cow.	لوعد سديد قرشي يان كوسني
69.—I am very thirsty.	هراد بدن بي هى
70.—It is very hot.	و كلپول بدن يهى
71.—Remain here.	هلك قدسو
72.—Open the door.	البابك قر
73.—I shall go to my country.	مغا لديثي بان تگى
74.—Where is the book?	كتابكى ميه
75.—Are you able to do this?	ادگ سداس انه قشو مكرت
76.—What are you looking at?	مهاد ارقيس
77.—Tell me what will be the charge?	اڏے امس لسني
78.—Where did you buy this cloth?	ڏرك هگے بادك ايبسدتى
79.—Did you buy it or barter for it?	مياد ايبسدتي مسے و دورستى
80.—Where is the captain of the vessel?	دونيد ناخودا هيثدي ميه
81.—The captain is on shore.	ناخودا هيبتو جر
82.—Take a chair and sit down.	كورسيگ كين و كوقدسو
83.—When will you do this work?	گور ماد شغلك سيثيس
84.—I shall finish it in four days.	انگ افر درارو دبديد و دمثنى
85.—I am going to Zayla to-morrow.	انگ زيلع (or اودل) برّان تگي
86.—Show me a sample of the rice.	بريسك مد بكيس ايقوس

87.—Where did you hear this ? وٗہ ھگے بادک

88.—I heard it yesterday on the road. شالی ڈوگي بان کو مغلی

89.—It is cooler to-day than yesterday. مانت شالیٹک قبوب

90.—Are there any fish in this water ? بیٖوہ اٗوہ کلن کو جر

91.—I am very busy to-day. مانت ھوٗل بدن بان لیتھی

92.—Take the horse home, and bring it at 6 o'clock. فرسک اغلکیٹگي گیٹی لیہ ساعدود ایکین

93.—Why did you go to sleep ? مہادو سیہٹی

94.—Does your wife make mats ? ناگتادو درمو مقلقیٹیس

95.—I do not understand what you say. وٗھاد لیدہي گرن مایو

96.—Is your knife sharp ? مندیدادیم اٗبدن تھی

97.—This box is heavy : how can I carry it ? صندوقن وٗ اولس یہي سدے بانو قادي کر

98.—Fill this tub with water. برمیلک بیٖو کو بوہي

99.—The river is deep. دردرک وٗ ڈیر یہي

100.— Take some water to quench your thirst. بیٖو اب ھراڈک کبیع

Vocabulary and Grammatical Analysis with Notes and Transliteration.

51.—**Adiga whahâ mâ donaisa ?**

52.—**Aniga wahâ donî mâyo.**

53.—**Ûsbûhda Barbara wâ kû gan'a adag tahai.** *Ûsbûhda=ûsbûh*, s. f., salt, with the def. art. affixed. *Gan'a* s. f., price, cost. *Adag*, adj., dear, tight. *Tahai*, 3rd pers. sing. fem. from *ahâo* be. (H. s. 132).

54.—**Mukhâ barîs wâ kû gan'a jaban yahai.** *Jaban*, cheap, past part. of *jab*, v. break. *Yahai*, 3rd pers. sing. masc. of *ahâo*.

55.—**Aḍigan aiya leh ?** *Aḍi*, s. m. sheep or goat ; *gan=an*, demon. pron., this with the consonant *g* prefixed, because the word with which it is used (*aḍi*) terminates in a vowel. (H. ss. 58 and 22). *Aiya*, interrog. pron., who ? *Leh*, from *âleh*, adj. root, possessed of : the *â* is here lost, because the article possessed is mentioned. (H. s. 253).

56.—**Hâlai donî Mukhâhgî ka-timî.** — *Hâlai*. adj. of time, last night. *Donî*, s. f., boat. (large).

57.—**Mânta laba bûghûl awr ba-so'-galai.** — *Bûghûl*, s. m. hundred. *So'-galai*, v. entered ; compounded of *so'*, move, and *gal*, enter.

58.—**Meshatan 'êl mâ kû-jira ?** — *'El*, s. m., well. *Kû-jir*, v. contain : *kû* is here a preposition or verbal particle. (H. s. 135).

59.—**Meshatan dadka mâ-laga âbsoda.** — *Dad*, s. m, people, inhabitants. *La*, a particle, which when prefixed to a verb gives it a passive signification. (H. s. 243). *Laga=la*, with the article added.

60.—**Mahâ kû helâi ?** — *Hêl*, v., obtain, get.

61.—**Mâ yâd bûkta or Adiga mâ bûkta ?** — *Yâd*, pers. pron. 2, thee; simple nominative form, assisted by the consonant *y*. *Bûk*, v., be sick : *bûkta*, 2nd pers. sing. pres., habitual.

62.—**Ghalabka kolaigî kû-ridd.** — *Ghalab*, s. m., baggage. *Kolai*, s. m. basket. *Kû-ridd*, v., throw, put.

63.—**Dakso kâlê.** — *Dakso*, adv., quickly. *Kâlê*, interjec., come !

64.—**Aniga kû-yeḍai : mahâd iman waidî ?** *Yeḍ*, v., call, send for. *Iman*, p.p. of *ima*, v., come. *Waidî*, 2nd pers. sing. pres. of *wa*, not found. (H. s. 90).

65.—**Usaga waran ba kû-dilai.** — *Dilai*, 3rd pers. sing. perf. of *dil*, v., kill.

66.—**Usaga ḍabarka waran ba kû-waremai.** — *Dabar*, s. m., back. *Warên*, v. 1. stab, thrust. *Waremai*, 3rd pers. sing. perf. (the letter *n* changing into *m* in the inflexion).

67.—**Haga in-an tago bân ka baghaiya.** — *Baghaiya* 1st pers. sing. pres. of *bagh*, v., fear. [It is somewhat curious that in Somâli, as well as in Arabic, Persian, Hindustânî, &c., the verb 'to fear' should be preceded by the sign of the ablative case (*ka*)].

68.—**Lo'da sided karshi yân kû sinaiya.** — Lo', s. f. cow. *sided*, s. f., eight.

69.—**Harrâd badan bai haiya.** — *Harrâd*, s. m., thirst. *Bai*, compounded of *ba* and *i*, to or by me. *Haiya*, from the verb *hai*, have, possess. (H. s. 251).

70.—**Wâ kuḷûl badan yahai.** — *Kulôl*, adj., hot, warm.

71.—**Halka faḍiso.** — *Fadiso*, v. 8., sit, remain.

72.—**Albâbka fur.** — Albâb, (Ar.) s. m., door. [It may be noticed that this word has here a double article : the Arabic article (*al*) prefixed, and the Somâli (*ka*) added ; but the former has become an inseparable part of the word in Somâli]. *Fur*, t. v., open :—(it also means 'divorce.')

73.—**Maghâladaidî bân tagaiya.**

74.—**Kitâbki meh ?** — *Kitâb* (Ar.) s. m. book, *meh*, adv. of place, — where ?

75.—**Adiga sidâs in-ad fasho mâ karta.** *Si-dâs*, adv. of manner, thus. *In-ad* = *in*, that and *ad*, thou. *Fasho*, 2nd pers. sing. pres. subj. of *fal*, do.

76.—**Mahâd arḳaisa ?**

77.—**I-ḍê immisa la-sinaiya.**—*Dê* v. aux., say, tell. *I-ḍê*, tell me. *La* the passive particle. (H. s. 243). *Sinaiya*, 3rd pers. sing. masc. pres. of *si*, give.

78.—**Ḍarka hagge bâd ka îbsadtai.** — *Dar*, s. m., cloth, apparel. *Bâd*, thou (H. s. 52). *Ka*, prep., from. [This particle is here (for the sake of euphony, I suppose), separated from *hagge*, the word to which it really belongs. Rejected by *hagge*, it would then naturally unite with *îbsadtai* ; but as the junction of these two words looks awkward in Arabic characters, I have written the *ka* as an affix to *bâd* ; thus treating it somewhat similarly to the pronominal affix ش in Persian.]

79.—**Mâ yâd îbsadtai, misse wâ dorsatai ?** *Misse*, conj., or else. *Dorî*, v. 3, barter, change.

80.—**Donîda nâkhûda-hedi mêh ?** — *Hedî*, possess. pron. 3rd pers. sing., fem., her (H. s. 55).

81.—**Nakhûda hebtû Jira.** — *Heb*, s. f., shore ; *hebta*, adv., ashore. The final *u* in *hebtû* is the pron., he.

82.—**Kûrsîga ken o kû faḍiso.** — *Kursi*, s. m. (Ar.), chair. *O*, equivalent to *wa*. (H. P. 100-101).

83.—**Gormâd shughlka samainaisa ?** — *Gormâ*, adv. of time, — when ? [*Gormûd* is really a combination of three words : — *gor*, s. f., time, *mâ*, — what ? and *ad*. pers. pron. 2, simple form.] *Shughl*, (Ar.), s. m., work, business.

84.—**Aniga afar ḍarârro dabaded wâ damaînaiya.** — *Ḍarârro*, pl. of *ḍarâr*, s. f., day. *Dabaded*, adv., after. *Damai*, v. 5, — finish.

85.—**Aniga Zel'a (or Audal) birrân tagaiya.** — *Zel'a* is the Arabic, and *Audal* the Somâli name of the town. *Birri*, s. f. to-morrow, *birrân*=*birrî* + *ân*, pers. pron. 1.

86.—**Barîska midab-kîsa i-tûs.** — *Midab*, s. m., sample. *Tûs*, v. imperative,—show.

87.—**Wahâ haggo bâd ka maghashai.** — *Maghashai*, 2nd pers. sing. perf. of *maghal*, v. hear. The letter *l*, as usual, changing into *sh*.

88.—**Shâlai daugî bân kû Maghalai.** — *Shâlai*, s. f., yesterday *Dau*, s. m., road.

89.—**Mânta shâlai ka ḳabob.** — *ḳabob*, adj. cool.

90.—**Bîyoha mâ wah kaluna kûjira.** — *kalun*, s. m., fish.

91.—**Mânta haul badan bân leyahai.** — *Haul*, s. f., affair, business.

92.—**Faraska aghalkaigî ge,î : leh sa'dod î-ken.** — *Ge,î*, v. 3., remove, take away. *Leh*, s. f., six. *Sâ'd* (Ar. ساعة), s. f. — hour ; pl. *sâ'do*. The final *d* is added because the word is preceded by a numeral. (H. s. 31 (b)).

93.—**Mahâd û sehatai ?** — *Seho*, v. 4, sleep.

94.—**Nâgtâdo dirmo má-falḳînaisa ?** — *Nag*, s. f., woman, wife. *Dirmo*, s. f., mat. *Falḳî*, t. v. 3., — plait (mats).

95.—**Wahâd ledahai garan mâyo.** — *Wahâd=wah+ad*. *Garan*, p. part. of *garo*, v. 4., understand, know.

96.—**Mindîdâdî Mâ af-badan tahai ?** — *Mindî*, s. f., knife. *Af-badan*, adj., sharp; (*af* = edge).

97.—**Sandûḳ-an wa olus yahai : sidde bân ûḳâdî kara ?** — *Ṣandûḳ* (ar.), s. m., box : *Ṣanduḳ-an*, this box. (H. s. 58). *Olus*, adj., heavy. *Kâd*, v., lift, carry : *kâdi kara*, 1st pers. sing. pres. poten.

98.—**Barmîlka bîyo kû bohi.** — *Barmîl*, (Ar.) s. m., tub, cask. *Bohi*, v. 3, fill.

99.—**Durdurka wâ ḍer yahai.** — *Durdur*, s. m., river, stream. *Ḍer*, adj., deep.

100.—**Bîyo ab : harrâdka ka-bî.'** — *Harrâd*, s. m., thirst. *Ka-bî'*, v. 3., quench.

FOLKLORE IN SOUTHERN INDIA.

No. 30.

BY PANDIT NATESA SASTRI, M.F.L.S.

The Arch-Impostor.

In a certain country there lived a Brâhmaṇ who had **seven sons.** One moonlight night he called them all to his side and **questioned** them as to what they would most like to do at that moment. The first said that he would like to water his fields; the second, that he would go out on a journey; the third, that he would plough his lands, and so on. But the **seventh** and the last **said** that he would spend that fine moonlight night in a beautiful house with lovely girls by his side. The father was pleased with the simple replies of the first six boys; but when the last — who was the youngest — expressed so evil a desire, in such a presence, and in such a way, his rage knew no bounds. "Quit my house at once," said the father, and **away ran the seventh son.**

He left his country and his house that very night, as he was ashamed to live under his father's roof any longer, and went to the wood hard by. In the midst of this wood there dwelt an **old woman** who used to sell muffins and puddings to shepherds and boy neatherds who frequented the wood in the course of their employment. This had been her source of livelihood for several years, and she had in this way amassed considerable wealth in the shape of gold coins which she kept locked up in a small box. Now the seventh son, on his banishment from home, went to her and said :—

"Madam, I am a poor helpless orphan, will you kindly take me into your service ? I shall be a great help to you in your old age."

So the old woman, pitying the poverty of the boy, and thinking he could help her took him into her service, and promised to feed him and bring him up as her own son.

"What is your name ?" asked the grandam.

"**My name,**" replied the boy, "**is Last Year** (*Pônavarusham*)!"

No doubt it was a queer name, but the old woman did not suspect anything, and thought within herself that such a designation was possible.

Full six years the boy lived with her, and behaved in such a way that she came to regard him almost as her son. She was delighted that God had sent her in her old age such a helper.

One night, just before going to supper, this boy, who had now grown to be a man, threw away all the water in the house, and then sat down to his food. Consequently, when his meal was over, there was no water in the house to wash his hands with; so the old woman went out to fetch water from a well that was at a little distance. Our hero, who will be henceforth called **the Arch-Impostor,** resolved to take the opportunity thus given him to **walk away with all the old woman's savings.** He did not wait to wash his hands, but ran off at once with her box of money. Going to a little distance in the wood, he broke it open, emptied the contents into his cloth, and went onwards at random. He walked on for two days and nights, and on the third morning was on the point of emerging from the forest.

Just after he had run away the old woman returned with water from the well, and found no boy. The thought rushed into her mind at once that she might have been deceived, and on quickly searching, she missed her box. Running to the village near her house she raised a loud cry, saying, "**Last Year robbed my box,** Last Year robbed my box," meaning of course that the person named "Last Year" had taken away her box. But as the words she used —*pônavarusham en peṭṭiyai tirudikkoṇḍu pônân*—also mean, "last year (some one) robbed my box," the people only thought she had gone mad, and sent her away. However often she might explain that "Last Year" was the name of a man, they would not listen to her. Thus was the poor woman deceived.

Meanwhile, our hero, whom we left on the point of emerging from the forest with his bundle of gold coins on his back, was attacked by a bear. He had covered his body and the bundle as well with his upper cloth so as not to arouse suspicion. The bear placed one of its front paws on his shoulder where his bundle was, and our hero, to prevent the animal from doing any harm to him, took a firm hold of the other front paw which the beast had also raised, and ran round and round with it. Meanwhile the paw on his shoulder had made a hole in the bundle of coins, so that every now and then a gold coin dropped out. While this was going on a rich Muhammadan merchant, having a load of money with him, happened to ride by. Seeing a traveller attacked by a bear, he at once went to the rescue. Whereupon the Arch-Impostor, ever ready to turn everything to his own advantage, addressed him thus :—

"Friend, calmly pursue your course. Do not disturb yourself. This is a bear on which I pronounced an incantation, whereby it drops a gold coin every time that I go round with it. I am testing it now, and have chosen this place to avoid the curiosity of other people. So, do not disturb me."

The Muhammadan, deceived by the composure with which the impostor spoke, and never suspecting that the coins were dropping from his bundle, replied :—"Friend, you appear to be a Brâhmaṇ from your face; and it is not very proper for a Brâhmaṇ to keep a bear in his house. Give it to me, and instruct me in the incantation. Take in return all the money I have on my horse, and the horse too if you like."

This was exactly what the impostor thought the Muhammadan would say. "My idea is working well," thought he within himself, and proceeded to become very reluctant to part with his bear. He also so managed that more coins began to drop, and the more the coins dropped the more the Muhammadan's mind was fixed with an ambition to become the master of the miraculous bear. He begged hard of the Brâhmaṇ, and the latter, as if unwilling to part with a brute which a few moments before he feared would take his life (!), at last told the Muhammadan to tie its hind legs together with a cord, and then its front legs. In this way the brute was safely caught. The Brâhmaṇ then pronounced a meaningless incantation over it, told the Muhammadan to repeat it unceasingly for a month before trying its efficacy. He then picked up every gold coin he had dropped, and took leave of his Muslim friend. Telling him that his house was in the New Street of Madura, he went away with the horse and all the money on it. The Muhammadan merchant, fully believing that after a month's repetition

the incantation would have the effect he saw, spent nearly all his days engaged in repeating it, and in taking care of the bear.

The Arch-Impostor after thus **duping the poor Muslim,** pursued his journey, and reached a village about evening. It was a very inhospitable village, and after searching here and there for a place to sleep in, he at last came to the street occupied by the courtezans. He chose the best house, took his bedding into the outer verandah, and lay down with his bundles beneath his head and his horse tied to a tree in front of the house. As he had a large amount of money to guard, sleep did not come to his eyes; he could merely pretend to be sleeping. At about dawn his horse evacuated, and the impostor pushed two gold coins into each piece of the horse-dung. He then returned to his bed and pretended to sleep as before. The sweeper of the house soon after came out to do her daily duty, and after sweeping the outer verandah went up to the horse to remove the horse-dung. But the Arch-Impostor at once arose and said :—" Do not touch the dung of that horse. It is all so much gold." After saying this he carefully collected it, and took out the gold coins. The sweeper was amazed. She ran in and informed the mistress of the house of what she saw. The **courtezan** came out, and to her astonishment she saw the impostor taking two gold coins out of each piece of the horse-dung. Quite amazed she asked what it all meant, and our hero replied :—

" Madam ! This is a horse given to me by a *yôgi,* (sage) who instructed me in a *mantra* (incantation). I pronounced it over the horse for a month, and ever since that period it has had the power of dropping gold coins with its ordure." The amazed and ambitious courtezan wanted to get possession of the horse, and learn the *mantra.* And our hero with a good deal of pretended reluctance parted with his horse in return for all her property. He then taught her some gibberish, which he told her was an incantation. He also told her that she must repeat it for a month, before it would work.

Thus **deceiving** the woman of the wood, the Muhammadan merchant, and the courtezan, our hero went to Madura, bought a good house in the New Street, true to his word to the Musalmân (and this was the only truth which he ever uttered in his life), and there married the daughter of a rich Brâhmaṇ, and lived happily and in comfort.

The old woman of the wood was almost mad after the loss of her hard-earned money. She traced the footprints of treacherous **Last Year** and followed them up, hoping to find him out some day or other. After a month's journey in the tracks she reached the place where the Muhammadan merchant was engaged in rearing the bear. He had long before the old woman's arrival finished the required number of incantations, and had gone round with the bear more than a thousand times without success. The old woman engaged him in conversation, and he related everything to her. This led to a mutual explanation of the manner in which they had been duped. The fiery Musalmân flew into a rage, and said :—" We must trace out the rogue and punish him."

The old woman agreed, and they both started for Madura. In their first day's journey they chanced to go to the village where the courtezan had been befooled, and where her story was well known. Every child there could tell them how over a month ago a rogue had come there and had deceived her about a horse and an incantation, and had walked away with all her property. The Musalmân soon identified the horse, and so the courtezan joined the old lady and the Muslim, and they all three went to Madura.

They found their enemy in the New Street, and he, getting up with a cheerful smile, welcomed them all, and after enquiring of their welfare asked them whether they had found the incantations useful. The old woman he consoled with an explanation of his sudden departure. He then requested them all to bathe and take their food, and himself showed the way to the river. Returning before the others, he asked his wife to prepare the ground for his worship of the household god, and also asked her to keep a pestle ready for him. He then asked her to bring the meal, pudding, &c., to be offered to the god, and to dress herself up as an old woman. He also told her that he would lightly beat her with the pestle, and throw her into the house, after which she was to suddenly appear again in the garb of a young woman, which, of course, was

her natural attire. All these instructions were issued before his three friends returned from the river, and though Musalmâns and courtezans are never allowed to enter the inner parts of a Brâhman's house, he pretended to show special consideration to them, and asked them to take their seats at a respectful distance, so as to observe what passed inside. The impostor then proceeded with the worship of the god on a grand scale. He pronounced several incantations, and when the worship was drawing to a close, an old woman, *i.e.* his wife in that attire, brought the offerings. He caught hold of her by her hair, and with his other hand felt for the pestle. The Musalmân and the others at once flew to the rescue of the old woman, but with a smile of perfect composure the impostor said :—

"My friends, do not think I want to kill her. If I beat her with this pestle and throw her into the house, she will return as a young girl. I have made many such old women young by the administration of this pestle." Thus saying he proceeded to beat the old woman and threw her into the house. And the impostor's wife, as well up in tricks as her husband, though she had lived with him for less than a month, came out as a young girl. The three old friends who came to be even with the old rogue wondered at what they saw.

They consulted among themselves :—"The fellow is really here; so, we can wreak our vengeance upon him whenever we choose. For the present let us obtain his pestle and depart as friends."

The worship was soon over, and our hero proceeded to look to the convenience of his visitors. He asked them to have some food, and superintended their meals himself. They all concealed their anger for the nonce in the hope of getting hold of the pestle, which he gladly allowed them to take away for a week. The three thus duped again went away to their respective houses with the pestle, and made arrangements as to the use of it.

The courtezan knew many old women in her street whom she wished to convert into young ones. So she wanted it first, and the old lady of the wood made up her mind to stay with her to witness the experiment, while the Muhammadan merchant agreed to take the pestle after a week from the courtezan. Thus it was her fortune to try it first. Alas! many a woman she killed with it in the fond hope that one at least would be transformed to a young woman. No transformation came after all; only death was the result. So before even the week was up the courtezan sent the pestle to the Muslim, duly informing him how unsuccessful she found it to be. But he blamed her not being a good hand at thrashing, and had soon himself pounded to death several old women among his relatives. Being then again deceived he went to the courtezan, and said to her : "My friend, see how we have been duped a second time. How many of our dear relatives we have killed. Let us go to that man again, and kill him before he again contrives to deceive us."

"Agreed," said she, and they started off again with the old lady of the wood. After a long journey, they reached the impostor's house, and found him absent. On enquiry they came to know that he had gone to the river to bathe. The old lady remained in his house, and the other two went after him. They carried a bag with them, and strong ropes also, and finding him bathing all alone, they surprised him, and tying up his hands and legs put him in the bag, and took him to a mountain near to burn him alive as a full revenge for all his deception. Climbing to the very top of it they placed the bundle down and went to the jungle near to collect fuel for the fire. Our hero was now in an awkward plight, but he kept saying to himself :—"I don't want to marry that girl, I don't want to marry that girl."

Now, while the Musalmân and the courtezan were away in the jungle collecting fuel, a neathord who was grazing a herd of cows a little below was attracted by the voice that kept on saying :—"I don't want to marry that girl." Coming up to our hero he said :—"What is the meaning of what you say? Why are you tied up thus in a bundle?"

Hope at once dawned in the impostor's breast, and he hastily replied :—"Friend, whoever you may be, you are my protector. Release me at once from this bag. My uncle and aunt want to marry me to a girl whom I do not like. Against my will they carried me up here to marry me to her. Fortunately they have just gone to some spring near to quench their thirst."

The stupid neatherd, little suspecting that it was odd that a man should be married on the top of a mountain, promised to open the bag and let him out on condition he would allow him to go into the bag himself, and thus be placed in his happy position.

"Agreed," said the impostor, and so the bag was quickly opened, the ropes round his legs and hands untied, and the neatherd packed up in his place. Our hero then went to the place where the herd of cows was grazing, and returned home with them. Here he found the old lady of the wood waiting and welcomed her heartily, telling her that all his wealth was hers, and promising to regard her as his own mother, as she had been one to him for six years.

Meanwhile the Musalmân and the courtezan had lighted a large fire in the jungle and went for the bag. The neatherd inside kept quite silent for fear, if he spoke, that the change that had taken place would become known. But, instead of being married to a young girl, he was soon thrown into the fire.

"Thus have we killed our impostor," said the friends :—"Now let us go to his house and plunder it." So they returned exulting to the New Street of Madura where our hero was sitting outside his house chewing betel, and expecting them every moment. The thousand and one cows he had obtained were still standing outside. When the pair saw him safely seated outside his own house and smiling welcome to them, their wonder knew no bounds. "We threw you an hour ago in the fire," said they, "and how are you sitting here safe ?"

"Yes, my friends," replied he, "as soon as you threw me into the fire, I went to Kailâsa, the world of felicity, and met my father and grandfather. They told me that my time to live in the world was not over and sent me back with these kine."

"Then the same presents will be given to us, too, if we go to that world of heavenly bliss ?" said they.

"Undoubtedly," replied the impostor ; and then with their consent he took them to the mountain and threw them into the fire never more to revive and return with presents.

Returning home and relieved for ever from his troublesome friends the Arch-Impostor lived happily, protecting the old woman of the wood, who had protected him in his younger days.

Though the hero has the worst of characters, still the relaters of this story excuse him for his presence of mind in all his hardships, and draw a moral from it that **ambition is bad.** The Musalmân and the courtezan, even though they repeatedly found out their friend, were always fired with ambition, and at last lost their lives through it.

CORRESPONDENCE.

THE DANISH ROYAL ACADEMY'S PRIZE REGARDING THE PHILOLOGICAL POSITION OF SANSKRIT IN INDIA.

SIR,—It may interest your readers to know that the Académie Royale Danoise des Sciences et des Lettres offers the Gold Medal of the Academy as a prize for the best answer to the following question : **"What position has Sanskrit occupied in the general development of languages in India ? To what extent can we say that it has been a living language, and at what period must it be admitted to have ceased to be such ?** The Academy points out that the inscriptions of Aśôka, dating from the middle of the 3rd century B. C., were couched in a language differing in no small degree from Sanskrit, and were spread all over the north of India. On this is founded a theory that Sanskrit had already ceased to be a living language, and that only that portion of its literature which is anterior to the Scythic invasion can be regarded as ancient and natural, while all the subsequent literature is due to a later and artificial development, the work of the Brâhmans, and does not reach to a date earlier than the second century A. D. On the other hand one can scarcely allow that such poems as the lyrics and epics of Kâlidâsa were only written for the learned, and that his dramas were not made to be represented and understood by the ordinarily educated people of his time, and the case is the same with other works written in Sanskrit after the Christian era. We should also have to explain why Sômadêva, at the beginning of the 12th century, should have chosen a dead and purely learned language for composing a work of light reading, of which the aim was to divert and console the queen of Kaśmîr who had lost her grandson.

Answers may be written in Latin, French, English, German, Swedish, or Danish. They

should not bear the name of the author, but a motto, and should be accompanied by a sealed envelope bearing the same motto, and enclosing the name, profession, and address of the author. Members of the Academy who reside in Denmark will take no part in the competition. Answers should be addressed, before the end of October 1889, to the Secretary of the Academy M. H. G. Zeuthen, Professor at the University of Copenhagen. The prizes will be declared in February 1890, and the authors can thereupon have their essays returned to them. G. A. GRIERSON.

MISCELLANEA.

PROGRESS OF EUROPEAN SCHOLARSHIP. No. XV.

A Year of the Revue Critique; July 1887 *to June* 1888.

(*a*) *Aug. 8th.*—The first important article of interest to oriental students is a review of two works by Prof. Th. Nöldeke. The first is a sketch of the Semitic languages[1] originally written for the *Encyclopædia Britannica*, and since then enlarged, and reproduced in German. The second is a history of the Arab dynasty of the Ghassânîs.[2] The article is by M. J. Halévy, and contains an interesting note on the primitive habitat of the Aramæans, which he places in the south of the Syrian desert, bounded by the Hijâz, Najd, and the maritime tracts of Babylonia. Both works are highly praised by the reviewer.

(*b*) *Aug. 15th.* — M. A. Barth contributes a review of the present writer's and Dr. Hoernle's works in connection with the Bihârî language.

(*c*) *Oct. 24th.*—The same gentleman reviews Prof. Jolly's Tagore Law Lectures on "an outline of a History of the Hindû law of Partition, Inheritance, and Adoption, as contained in the original Sanskrit treatises." The author, M. Barth considers, studies each institution historically, bringing to light the differences concerning it, which appear through a long series of texts, and he endeavours to explain these differences by referring them to a process of regular development. The various discussions show his familiarity with legal questions, and with comparative legislation, and no one could read the book without deriving great benefit from it. Dr. Jolly differs from Mr. Nelson in considering the juridical literature of India as really its legislation. It is a body of written custom, not only held holy, but universally practised and regularly applied by the public authorities. It has always kept in touch with actual facts, modifying itself as they have become modified. M. Barth combats this theory, considering that the *smṛiti* has been only moderately practised. The official law has often been a very incomplete, and frequently an entirely false representation of the true custom, and whenever there was a conflict between the two, it is the former which has usually had the worst of it. One of the best proofs of this is the differences of doctrine between the various legal schools. Do these schools really represent the law of their tracts? One has only to see the disorder of their traditions, and the fantastic manner in which they borrow from each other, without regard either to geographical vicinity, or to affinities of population, to be satisfied on this point. Theories might travel thus, but not customs.

(*d*) *Oct. 31st.*—Dr. Percy Gardner's Catalogue of the Greek and Scythic Kings of Bactria and India in the British Museum is reviewed. The author of the notice is M. Darmesteter. He observes, "there are few historical periods of more fascinating interest than that of the four centuries which followed the death of Alexander, in the tracts of country bordering on Persia and on India. A Greek empire in Bactria, from the Oxus to the Hindû Kûsh, which soon crosses the mountains, absorbs Eastern Afghanistan, passes the Indus, reaches the Yamunâ on the right, the Sea of Gujarât on the south, covers the Indian coasts with Greek temples, of which the ruins still existed in the second century, and brings into India Greek writing, Greek art, and all that the spirit of a Hindû could receive of the Hellenic genius. An invasion of Turkish tribes, who cast upon the Greek frontier by the same movement as that which step by step impelled Attila upon the gates of Rome, come to destroy the empire of Alexander's successors, whilst succeeding as their heirs, to reopen the route of the Greeks in India, to enthrone Buddhism, and, at the same time as Buddha, all the pantheon of Iranian Zoroastrianism. Between the Greeks and the Scythians, are the more or less violent struggles of the Parthians, who send to Western India sometimes governors for the Arsacides, sometimes adventurers who founded dynasties. For all this period, at once confused and fecund (for it is from this chaos that modern India has emerged) there remain but four kinds of documents: a few lines, more or less vague, in the classical writers, a few pages in the Chinese annals, a few inscriptions of the Indo-Scythians, and thousands of coins. Numismatists have there-

[1] *Die Semitischen Sprachen, Eine Skizze*, von Th. Nöldeke, Leipzig, T. O. Weigel, 1887.

[2] *Die Ghassânischen Fürsten aus dem Hause Gafna's*, von Th. Nöldeke. Berlin, Librairie academique, 1887.

fore the field almost entirely to themselves." Taking Mr. Gardner's book as his text M. Darmesteter next proceeds to reconstruct a history of these times. Bactria was a province of the Seleucide empire till about the year 250 B. C. About that time Diodorus made himself independent in Bactria, and Arsaces did the same in Parthia. This was the origin of the Græco-Bactrian and of the Parthian empires. The dynasty of Diodorus was supplanted by Euthydemus of Magnesia (about 208 B. C.), whose son, Demetrius, pressed on the north by the Barbarians, crossed the Paropamisus (or Hindû Kush) and entered the country of Kâbul and the Pañjâb. This was the commencement of the Græco-Indian empire. With Eukratides (190 ?) the great rival and successor of Demetrius, we first come upon bilingual coins, with a Pâli legend added to the Greek one. A great number of kings followed, of whom two, Apollodotus and Menander, were known to classical writers, and whose money was found to be still in circulation by the Greek travellers of the first century of the present era. Hermæus was the last of the Indo-Greek kings. About 25 B. C., the Scythians of Bactria crossed the Paropamisus, and invaded India. We know of coins of five Indo-Scythic kings, of whom Kanishka was the most famous. The Śaka era dates, not from the expulsion of the Scythic invader, but from his accession. Under this dynasty the Iranian religion of Zoroaster penetrated into India, and we find traces of Persian influence in Indian Epic poetry, which should be ascribed to the same time. These Indo-Scythians were very eclectic in religious matters. They knew Helios, Salene and Serapis. They knew Buddha; and again they recognized Skanda-Kumâra and Viśâkha.

A third race of invaders was that of the Parthians, who appear to have established themselves in the Kâbul valley about 161 B. C. The Peripleus shows us this dynasty as expiring in the Delta of Sindh towards the middle of the first century.

(*e*) *Dec. 5th.*—"J. D." reviews Dastur Tahmuras Dinshawji Anklesaria's **Compendium of the Social Code for the Parsis** (Parsi Fort Printing Press, Bombay, 1887). This is a well printed facsimile of a Pahlavî text on civil law lately discovered by the Editor. The text is principally important on account of the authorities which it cites, and which are those of the classic literature. The last pages are valuable as containing a religious and political history of the last Sasânî.

(*f*) *January 16th*, 1888 — Commences with a review of the first volume of the **Catalogue of Arabic MSS. in the Royal Library at Berlin**, by M. Hauvette. The author of the Catalogue is Herr W. Ahlwardt. It is described as a monument of solid and powerful construction. The present volume is in two parts, the first devoted to *Prolegomena* and to general subjects, the second to the *Qurân*.

(*g*) *Feb. 6th.*—M. Derenbourg has published the first fasciculus of John of Capua's Latin version of the **Kalîlah and Dimnah**. This is reviewed by M. Rubens. Two Hebrew versions of the tale are known, and the older of the two, attributed to the Rabbin Joel, has a special importance as being the original of the Latin version above mentioned. Unfortunately a large portion of this Hebrew version, including the prefaces, the two first chapters, and a portion of the third, is lost. and the present edition of the Latin version is published to supply the deficiency. It has hitherto been printed only once (about the year 1483), and has become so rare as to be almost unprocurable. The present edition is very satisfactory, and the first fasciculus contains the prefaces and nine chapters.

(*h*) *Feb. 27th.*—There is a short notice by M. Barth on **Cham literature**. The Chams were originally masters of the whole of Annam. M. Antony Landes has published a French translation of sixteen Cham tales, and of a children's song. The basis of the tales is the marvellous, without any alloy of mythology or theology. Only once or twice does the Lord Alwah, "the master of the sky," and probably identical with the Allâh of the Musalmân Chams, appear. The translation appears in *Excursions et Reconnaissances*. The same number of the latter contains the fac-simile of a **Cham inscription** communicated by M. E. Navelle. It is in the name of Śrî Jaya Siṁha Dêva, and also contains the proper name Śrî Hari Dêva and the word *dharmma*. It is dated 1191.

(*i*) *March 10th.*—In this number is a review by M. V. Henry of M. Paul Regnaud's work on the **Origin and Philosophy of Language or Principles of Indo-European Linguistics**. The author endeavours to reply to the following propositions; (1) To explain and criticize the various systems which, from the earliest times to the present day, have had for their aim to explain philosophically the origin and the laws of language; (2) To collect from the more important contemporary philological works the principles and the laws which could serve in the formation of a philosophy of language. The first portion of the book is described as excellent, and as displaying a great amount of labour and of learning on the part of the author. Regarding the second part M. Henry, while admiring the ingenuity displayed is unable to concur with the conclusions arrived at.

(*j*) *March 26th.*—The late Dr. Hanusz of Vienna was the author of a pamphlet on the encroach-

ments of the n-declension in Sanskṛit which is favourably noticed by M. Louis Duvau. The most interesting case noticed is the *n* in terminations of genitives plural like *sênânâm*. Dr. Hanusz shows that the *n* was first borrowed from bases in *n* to form the genitives of bases in *â* long, and then to form those of bases in *a* short.

(*k*) *April 2nd.* — Commences with a review by M. Rubens Duval of Mr. Margoliouth's edition of the **Oriental versions of the Poetics of Aristotle.** The texts published are the Arabic version of Abû Bashar, the definition of tragedy in the Syriac dialogues of James Bar-Shakaku, the Arabic Poetics of Avicenna, and the Syriac Poetics of Bar-Hebræus. The reviewer considers that Mr. Margoliouth has shown in his edition an equal knowledge of Greek, Arabic and Syriac, and future publishers of Aristotle's Poetics will be bound to take his work into consideration.

(*l*) *April 23rd.* — Passing over notices of an edition of the twenty-first volume of the **Kitâb al-aghanî**, by Dr. Brünnow, and a review of the Rev. A. Foster's **Elementary lessons in Chinese**, we come to a short article by M. Baudouin on Prof. Windisch's work on the **characteristic** *r* **in verbal forms.** Dr. Windisch conjectures that originally for the middle and active voices there were two sets of inflexions, characterised respectively by the presence or by the absence of the *r* and the *t*. In the middle there would be for the first and third persons of the singular, and for the third of the plural, the terminations *-â*, *-ê*, *-rê*, and (Gr. μαι ?), and *tê*, *-ntê*; in the active they would be, *a* (*-â* ?), *-a*, *-ur*, and *-mi*, *-ti*, *-nti*. The reviewer considers that this conjecture is very plausible, and that it throws an entirely new light on primitive conjugation.

We may pass over two favourable reviews, one by M. A. Barth on Dr. Cust's second series of Linguistic and Oriental Essays, and the other by M. Sylvain Lévi on Dr. Speijers' Sanskṛit Syntax, which has been already noticed in these pages, and come to a short paper by M. V. Henry on Dr. P. von Bradke's **Essays on the Prehistoric Development of the German Language.** The principal argument of Dr. von Bradke deals with the influence of subject races on the language of the conquerors, and, as an example, he would superimpose a Græco-Italo-Celtic group of languages over the already accepted Italo-Celtic groups, explaining by foreign influence the numerous and important differences between the language and civilisation of Latium and Hellas.

G. A. GRIERSON.

[1] In line 2 of this record, the dynastic name is very distinctly written Kalaturya.

[2] The times here, all through, are for Baṅkâpur, which of old was a town of considerable importance.

[3] See von Oppolzer's Canon, pp. 228, 229, and Plate 114.

[4] *id.* p. 361.

CALCULATIONS OF HINDU DATES.

No. 27.

In the back-yard of Yellappagauḍa at **Hulgûr**, a village about seven miles to the north-east of Śiggâṁve, the chief town of the Baṅkâpur Tâlukâ of the **Dhârwâḍ District**, Bombay Presidency, there is an Old-Kanarese stone inscription of the **Kalachuri**[1] **king Sômêśvara**, which contains three dates.

The first date (from an ink-impression; line 18 f.) is — Śaka-varsha 1096 neya Jaya-saṁvatsarada Jyêshṭhada amâvâsye Âdityavâra sûryyagrahaṇa-vyatîpâtad-andu, — "the new-moon *tithi* of (the month) Jyêshṭha of the Jaya saṁvatsara, which is the 1096th Śaka year; Sunday; at the time of the vyatîpâta of an eclipse of the sun."

The second date (line 35 f.) is — Śaka-varshada 1096neya Jaya-saṁvatsarada Mârgaśirada puṇṇami Âdityavâra sômagrahaṇad-andu, — "the full-moon *tithi* of (the month) Mârgaśira of the Jaya saṁvatsara, which is the 1096th of the Śaka years; Sunday; at the time of an eclipse of the moon.

And the third date (l. 40 f.) is — Śaka-varshada 1096neya Jaya-saṁvatsarada Mârgaśira-bahuḷad-amavâsye Maṅgaḷavâra sûryagrahaṇad-andu, — "the new-moon *tithi* of the dark fortnight of (the month) Mârgaśira of the Jaya saṁvatsara, which is the 1096th of the Śaka years; Tuesday; at the time of an eclipse of the sun."

By the southern luni-solar system of the Sixty-year Cycle, the Jaya saṁvatsara coincided with Śaka-Saṁvat 1097 current; *i. e.* with the given year, 1096, as an expired year. And, by Prof. K. L. Chhatre's Tables, I find that, in this year,—

The amânta Jyêshṭha kṛishṇa 15 ended, not on a Sunday, but at about 22 *ghaṭîs*, 53 *palas*, after mean sunrise, for Baṅkâpur,[2] on Saturday, 1st June, A. D. 1174. On this day there was an eclipse of the sun,[3] which was visible in India. But the week-day does not correspond with that given in the record; at least, it does not do so, if the record is to be interpreted as meaning that the *tithi* ended, and the eclipse occurred, on the Sunday.

Mârgaśira śukla 15 ended, as required, on Sunday, 10th November, A. D. 1174, at about 36 *gh.* 42 *p.* And on this day there was an eclipse of the moon,[4] visible in India.

And the amânta Mârgaśira kṛishṇa 15 ended, as required, on Tuesday, 26th November, A. D. 1174, at about 13 *gh.* 51 *p.* And on

this day there was an eclipse of the sun,[5] visible in India.

It is to be noted that, in the second and third dates, in which the results work out quite regularly, **the term vyatîpâta** is not used. And, as there is no reason for suggesting that any portion of the record is not genuine, **the explanation of the discrepancy in the results for the first date in it,** is perhaps to be found in the use there of the term in question; which may indicate some astrological conditions that necessitated the observance of the rites of that eclipse on the following day, Sunday, instead of on the day on which it actually occurred. I hope that someone will be in a position to examine and explain this point. The only other solution is to assume a mistake in calculation by the person who prepared the almanac, from which the date was taken by the preparer of the record.

No. 28.

At the same village of **Hulgûr,** on two of the faces of the lower part of a pillar in the well called Kallamaṭhada-bhâvi in Survey No. 78, there is a Sanskṛit and Old-Kanarese **inscription of the Dêvagiri-Yâdava king Mahâdêva,** in which the date (from an ink-impression; line 15 ff.) is — Śaka-varshada[6] 1189neya Prabhava-saṁvatsarada Jyêshṭha[7]-ba-30-Budhavâra sûrya grahaṇad-andu, — "**Wednesday,** the 30th *tithi,* in the dark fortnight, of (the month) Jyêshṭha of **the Prabhava saṁvatsara,** which is the 1189th of the Śaka years; **at the time of an eclipse of the sun.**"

By the southern luni-solar system of the Sixty-Year Cycle, **the Prabhava saṁvatsara** coincided with Śaka-Saṁvat 1190 current; *i. e.* with the given year, 1189, as an expired year. In this year, Jyêshṭha itself was intercalary, according to the Tables. And I find that —

The natural *amânta* Jyêshṭha kṛishṇa 15 ended at about 43 *ghaṭîs* 45 *palas,* after mean sunrise, for Baṅkâpur, on Thursday, 23rd June, A. D. 1267; on which day there was no eclipse of the sun. **But the intercalated amânta Jyêshṭha kṛishṇa 15 ended, as required, on Wednesday, 25th May, A. D. 1267,** at about 20 *gh.* 45 *p.*; and **on this day there was an eclipse of the sun,** visible in India.[8]

This record is of interest, in giving an instance **of the quotation of the new-moon tithi as the thirtieth tithi of the month,** instead of as the fifteenth *tithi* of the dark fortnight. **An analogous instance** is to be found in an inscription at Jaynagar in the Moṅgir District, Bengal Presidency, dated in the reign of Madanapâladêva,[9] "the year 16 (?), Âśvina 30." But there is nothing to indicate for certain whether it is the new-moon *tithi,* or the full-moon *tithi,* that is thus numbered in the Jaynagar record; though it may be inferred to be the new-moon *tithi,* in accordance with what is the more general custom in the present day, even in Northern India[10].

J. F. FLEET.

PROFESSOR KIELHORN'S EDITION OF THE MAHABHASHYA.

Excellent as is **Prof. Kielhorn's edition of the Mahâbhâshya,** hyper-criticism can still lay its finger on a fault here and there. Prof. Kielhorn has, for instance, unfortunately followed the Indian copyists in regard to the divisions of the Mahâbhâshya into Âhnikas; *i.e.* he too has numbered the Paspaśâhnika as the first; and the Âhnika treating of the fourteen Sûtras, given according to tradition by Mahâdêva to Pâṇini, as the second, serially with the rest. Whereas, strictly, these two Âhnikas should be separated from the others, as introductory to them. The first Sûtra of Pâṇini is *Vṛiddhêr âdaich,* and not *Atha śabdânuśâsanam,* which was only added on by Patañjali to bring Pâṇini's Sûtras into conformity with the usage prevailing in the Sûtra-period. The usage was, always to declare the subject of every set of aphorisms at the beginning, and so to prepare the student for what he might expect, as is shown by the declaratory first Sûtra, commencing with *Atha,* of the Darśanas, Gṛihya and Śrauta-Sûtras, and Prâtiśâkhyas. Moreover, all the editions of the Ashṭâdhyâyî, which I have seen, separate the fourteen Sûtras of Mahâdêva from Pâṇini's text distinctly. The serial divisions of the Great Commentary proper should, therefore, extend from *Vṛiddhêr âdaich* and the Bhâshya thereon. High example may be pleaded in favour of the current division; but only example, and nothing more. For, so far as the present writer is aware, Kayyaṭa and Nâgôjîbhaṭṭa have not given any reasons for their adherence to it. The fact of their adherence can be explained away, by supposing that they were too much absorbed with their commentaries to bestow any time on such a comparatively unimportant work as formal improvement in the text they were dealing with. By the way, why should not the name of the author of the *Bhâshya-pradîpa* be spelt as Kayyaṭa? The analogy of Mammaṭa and Ubbaṭa speaks in favour of this form, as against the other ordinary forms of Kaiyaṭa and Kaiyyaṭa. It is supported by ancient MSS. as well.

GOVINDA DASA.

Durgakund, Benares.

---

[5] *id.* pp. 228, 229, and Plate 114.—See also the Dêgâṁve inscription of Kaliyuga-Saṁvat 4275 expired, *ante,* Vol. XVII. p. 266, No. 17.

[6] The actual reading in the original is *varuśada.*

[7] The actual reading is *jêshṭa.*

[8] *id.* pp. 238, 239, and Plate 119.

[9] *Archæol. Surv. Ind.* Vol. III. Pl. xlv., No. 17, line 4.

[10] See Mr. Sh. B. Dikshit's remarks, *ante,* Vol. XVI. p. 114.